OXFORD



Jonathan A. Silk

Managing Monks

Administrators and Administrative Roles in Indian Buddhist Monasticism

Managing Monks

SOUTH ASIA RESEARCH

SERIES EDITOR
Patrick Olivelle

A Publication Series of
The University of Texas South Asia Institute
and
Oxford University Press

The Early Upaniṣads
Annotated Text and Translation
Patrick Olivelle

Indian Epigraphy
A Guide to the Study of Inscriptions in Sanskrit,
Prakrit, and the Other Indo-Aryan Languages
Richard Salomon

A Dictionary of Old Marathi
S. G. Tulpule and Anne Feldhaus

Donors, Devotees, and Daughters of God
Temple Women in Medieval Tamilnadu
Leslie C. Orr

Jīmūtavāhana's Dāyabhāga
The Hindu Law of Inheritance in Bengal
Edited and Translated with an Introduction and Notes by
Ludo Rocher

A Portrait of the Hindus
Balthazar Solvyns and the European Image of India 1740–1824
Robert L. Hardgrave

Manu's Code of Law
A Critical Edition and Translation of the Mānava-Dharmaśāstra
Patrick Olivelle

Nectar Gaze and Poison Breath
An Analysis and Translation of the Rajasthani Oral Narrative of Devnārāyan
Aditya Malik

Between the Empires
Society in India 300 BCE to 400 CE
Patrick Olivelle

Managing Monks

Administrators and Administrative Roles in Indian Buddhist Monasticism

JONATHAN A. SILK

OXFORD
UNIVERSITY PRESS
2008

OXFORD
UNIVERSITY PRESS

Oxford University Press, Inc., publishes works that further
Oxford University's objective of excellence
in research, scholarship, and education.

Oxford New York
Auckland Cape Town Dar es Salaam Hong Kong Karachi
Kuala Lumpur Madrid Melbourne Mexico City Nairobi
New Delhi Shanghai Taipei Toronto

With offices in
Argentina Austria Brazil Chile Czech Republic France Greece
Guatemala Hungary Italy Japan Poland Portugal Singapore
South Korea Switzerland Thailand Turkey Ukraine Vietnam

Published by Oxford University Press, Inc.
198 Madison Avenue, New York, New York 10016

www.oup.com

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data
Silk, Jonathan A.
Managing monks : administrators and administrative roles
in Indian Buddhist monasticism / Jonathan A. Silk.
p. cm. — (South Asia research)
Includes bibliographical references and index.
ISBN 978-0-19-532684-0
1. Monasticism and religious orders, Buddhist—India—Government—History. 2. Buddhism—India—Doctrines—History. 3. Buddhist literature—India—History and criticism. I. Title.
BQ6160.I4S55 2008
294.3657—dc22 2007029120

9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1

Printed in the United States of America
on acid-free paper

Preface

Understanding is possible only in context; things signify only in relation to other things. Despite this indisputable and obvious fact, far too many studies of Buddhism attempt to approach its worlds of thought and practice without regard for their institutional contexts. Some relevant studies do, of course, exist, with medieval China and Sri Lanka having been particularly well treated. Indian Buddhism, on the other hand, as so often seems to be the case, has generally received less thorough attention. I therefore offer the present attempt at a systematic examination of the administrators and administrative roles of Indian Buddhist monasticism without apology. A more comprehensive and synthetic appreciation of the management of these institutions will no doubt be possible in the future. For now, what I offer in the following pages is nothing more than a beginning.

An anonymous reader who vetted the manuscript for the publisher suggested that this book "will be considered as the Indian counterpart to Jacques Gernet's famous *Les aspects économiques du bouddhisme dans la société chinoise* immediately after publication, in spite of the fact that the evidence from China is infinitely richer than that from India." To have one's work compared to a masterpiece is a great honor. But with due gratitude for the reader's praise, I did not aspire to produce an Indian parallel to Gernet's work, if this is even possible with the resources available. Rather, while Gernet explored the interface between monastic institutions and

surrounding society, particularly with respect to economic relations, my focus has been much more narrowly set instead on those who direct the internal workings of the monastic organization itself. Toward this end, I have been particularly interested to discover who was tasked with taking care of the day-to-day running of the monastery—who was to make sure that monks had food available to them, that teachers had an audience, that meditators had a quiet place to sit. In modern parlance, I have been less interested here in the sermon itself, or in issues of church and state, than in who is charged with advertising the preacher's appearance, preparing the hall, setting up the chairs, making the coffee, and buying the cookies. This interest, of course, did not evolve in a vacuum.

The project which has now resulted in the present book began as a chapter of my 1994 doctoral dissertation, which centered on the *Ratnarāśi-sūtra*. That Mahāyāna scripture is concerned to a considerable extent with practical aspects of the cultivation of the Buddhist path. As evidence of this concern, the text contains a lengthy discussion of the monastic administrator called *vaiyāpṛtyakara*. In my efforts to understand what the sūtra has to say about this figure, I devoted one chapter of the dissertation's introduction to this term. When I returned to this material some years later, I came to feel that a fuller and more contextualized understanding of this administrator and his role, and thus a more complete understanding of the sūtra as a whole and the polemics in which it is engaging, could only be attained through a wider survey of the administration and management of Indian Buddhist monastic institutions. I chose to carry forward this investigation by means of a census of the central terms for monastic administrators or managers as they appear in the literary and inscriptional sources relevant to Indian Buddhism. I thus studied materials preserved in Sanskrit, Pāli, Tibetan, and Chinese, seeking to come to terms with the range of vocabulary employed for those with managerial or administrative responsibilities. One of the things I discovered is the wide range of usages of even seemingly identical titles. This, of course, is only to be expected. By their very nature, administrative terms are local and particular; we would expect that the ways a term is used in one time and place will not map perfectly or congruently onto the ways the same term is used in other circumstances. The process of canonization and transmission undergone by our main sources—scriptural materials, sūtras, and the texts of monastic rules and procedures, the Vinayas—however, has permanently erased from view the original temporal and geographic localizations of these texts and the communities whose views and practices they reflect. What we have available to us for the most part is a literary corpus within which original distinctions of time and place have been leveled. Our much less abundant inscriptional

sources and accounts of Chinese pilgrims to India, as well as older manuscript materials, allow us to correct for this erasure only in small measure. I have been able to go only as far as the sources will allow. I nevertheless hope and expect that future research will refine and correct the picture I have drawn here.

It would be an error if my treatment of the variety of sources available to me and my attempts to discover within diverse descriptions some common threads were to lead to the conclusion that traditional sources were confused, or that the terms and titles in question did not have concrete or clearly delimited meanings and uses in specific communities. It is much more likely instead that the diversity of depictions that has reached us hides the individuality of what were, in the beginning, distinct local usages. In addition, and from another perspective, it may be that different genres of literature, or different types of sources, employ terms in, once again, distinct ways. But this cannot be always and entirely the case. If it were, the administrator discussed in the *Ratnarāśi-sūtra* would be unrelated to the administrators whose roles are described in the Vinayas, for instance. We would then have to hypothesize that the *Ratnarāśi-sūtra* belonged to a community not governed by a Vinaya, which is to say, that it was composed in a nonmonastic community, something which is demonstrably untrue. There must be some relation between the worlds of the scriptures and those of other genres of Buddhist literature, inscriptions, and so on. I believe that further studies will be able to help us gain a clearer and more nuanced understanding of such problems. For the present, however, while I have remained aware of the dangers of conflation—and have duly sought in my presentation to avoid forcing one source's understanding upon another—I maintain my faith that this type of study, gathering together a wide range of material and attempting to make some sense of it, constitutes a real contribution to our knowledge of Indian Buddhist institutions. It is not perfect, it is not complete, and it is doubtless not always correct. It is, however, an attempt to survey a field hitherto rarely plowed. To follow that metaphor for a moment, it may be that my own plowing is not always as deep as it might have been, nor the furrows as straight as others might have made them. I hope, nevertheless, that what I have been able to do will invite others to cultivate the field as well.

I cherish this hope not only for the inherent interest of the subject, nor only for the central role that the study of institutions can and should play in helping us to paint a broad and holistic picture of Buddhism as a religion. The subject is also important for those more specifically concerned with Buddhist spiritual cultivation. For Buddhist authors themselves have debated the status of administration within the monastic community, engaging in polemics over

its value relative to meditation and study or preaching. This evident tension within Buddhist sources themselves, if nothing else, validates our attention to this topic and calls forth our efforts at understanding.

Although it began life as a chapter of my doctoral dissertation, this project took on a form similar to that it has now primarily in 2001–2002, during a year I was able to devote to research, supported by a Morse Junior Faculty Fellowship awarded to me by Yale University. For this, I remain very grateful. When I returned to the project several years later, I received valuable advice from Shayne Clarke, then a graduate student at UCLA. Richard Salomon read the manuscript for Oxford University Press, and kindly made known to me his identity when he shared several corrections and observations, for which I thank him. The work as it now stands was substantially completed in 2005, and only in one or two places have I been able to add references to studies published later. It may be, of course, that I have overlooked important works, and I hope and trust that readers will be kind enough to bring those, as well as errors, alternate interpretations, and other oversights, to my attention.

I owe my first acquaintance with the *Ratnarāśi-sūtra* to my colleague at UCLA, Gregory Schopen, who alerted me to the importance of monastic institutions in the study of Buddhism. Much of what I know about monastic Buddhism I learned from reading his work and from speaking with him about this and other topics over the years, and I remain grateful for his tutelage. His extensive, even unparalleled, familiarity with the monastic literature of the Mūlasarvāstivādins, preserved in Sanskrit and Tibetan, has produced insights and introduced discoveries of great interest. These studies allow entrée to the world of Mūlasarvāstivāda monasticism, often in a very organic and integrated way.

The book that I have written is designed to serve two functions. In the first place, it is designed to provide, from a relatively narrow starting point, a context for the discussions of the *Ratnarāśi-sūtra* on administration and thus for what I understand as a sort of "debate" over the proper roles and vocations of a Buddhist monk, particularly in Mahāyāna sources. In the second place, it is designed to serve as a collection of materials, a resource and reference from which interested scholars might draw for their own further studies. No such collection can be complete, and this one is not. Nor can any study hope to offer every possible interpretation or suggest every interesting hypothesis. And the present study, again, does not. But I believe that it does set forth the basic sources and does introduce the main materials on Indian Buddhist monastic administration and management available so far in Sanskrit, Pāli, Tibetan, and Chinese, interpreting them through comparative study and English translation in all cases where this is feasible. I understand this presentation of

materials, in fact, to be one of the primary aims of the Oxford University Press series South Asia Research, and I owe a particular debt to the series editor, Patrick Olivelle, for the faith he has shown in my work by including it in this series.

Finally, it remains to thank my family. They played virtually no part in the production of this study, and indeed may be said to have positively hindered it at times, tempting me to go to the park or the beach instead of sitting at my desk. But truth be told, they have been astonishingly undemanding and humble for years on end, allowing me extensive freedom to indulge my interests in topics they doubtless find boring beyond belief. For this, I cannot thank enough my wife, Yoko, and sons, Benjamin and Oliver.

This page intentionally left blank

Contents

Technical Details and Abbreviations

All primary materials translated or cited in the following can be found in the Textual Materials or, for shorter passages, in the notes. I have endeavored to establish the best possible textual basis for the sources I cite, within reason. Therefore, when reliable editions already exist, I have used them, though with reference to primary sources when possible. Otherwise, when possible, I have edited passages anew.

Specifically, for sources in Sanskrit, I have referred to the best editions and to (photographs of) manuscripts when access to them was possible. When I cite manuscripts, I provide folio and line information, and mark the first letter of each line in bold type when relevant. Klaus Wille graciously looked over several of my transcriptions, although he is in no way responsible for the final product's errors, for which I alone take full blame.

For Indian inscriptions, I refer to what I believe to be the best editions, although I have altered the transcription conventions favored by epigraphists to conform to the standard orthography of romanized Sanskrit. In some but not all cases, I have also consulted facsimiles of the rubbings.

For Pāli, I have cited the standard editions of the Pali Text Society, noting, however, that these path-breaking works represent, from a text-critical point of view, provisional rather than final editions.

For Chinese sources, I have referred to the standard Taishō edition of the Buddhist canon. I am aware that this edition is not always entirely reliable, but it was simply not possible to reedit every

citation. I romanize Chinese according to the Pinyin system. The punctuation of the Chinese is, for better or worse, mine.

In the case of Tibetan materials, I have attempted to minimally edit all passages I cite from canonical collections (Kanjur and Tanjur), except in the cases in which reliable editions already exist. Otherwise, for Kanjur texts, I have generally used the sTog and Derge editions and sometimes also Peking, while for texts in the Tanjur I refer to the Derge edition, sometimes comparing it with Peking. (During the long years in which this study took shape, I had no constant access to any one edition.) Such citations are therefore not critically edited in any scientific sense. Given the volume of material cited, I regret I was unable to fully refer to the range of sources which should, ideally, be consulted in establishing a Tibetan text edition.

For all other materials, including Jaina texts, I have used the most reliable editions available to me; references are provided in the notes.

It is worth stating that, where possible, I made use of electronic versions of texts, such as the SAT [Saṁgaṇikīkr̥taṁ Taiśotripiṭakaṁ] (and later CBETA [Chinese Buddhist Electronic Text Association]) files of the Chinese canon and the ACIP [Asian Classics Input Project] files of Tibetan texts. When I cite texts, however, I always have checked the printed editions upon which the electronic versions are based.

Abbreviations

BHS Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit
EMC Early Middle Chinese (Pulleyblank 1991)
LMC Late Middle Chinese (Pulleyblank 1991)
Mhy. *Mahāvyutpatti*. I have used Sakaki 1916, cited by entry number, but in every case the entries themselves were checked against Ishihama and Fukuda 1989, whose superior readings are generally accepted. In citing variants from this edition, in addition to P for Peking and D for Derge, N for Narthang, L for Leningrad and C for Cone are also used.
MS Manuscript

Tibetan Sources

D Derge Kanjur and Tanjur. For the most part, I have used the reproduction of the *par phud* (first edition) printing by the Sixteenth

Karmapa, published on CD-ROM by the Tibetan Buddhist Resource Center, New York. Text numbers from 1-1108 indicate the Kanjur, from 1109-4464 the Tanjur.

P Peking Kanjur and Tanjur. I have used the reprint edition published in Kyoto by Otani University. Text numbers from 1-1055 indicate the Kanjur, from 2000-5962 the Tanjur.

S sTog Kanjur. For the most part, I have used the reproduction published on CD-ROM by the Tibetan Buddhist Resource Center, New York.

All references are to text number, section name, volume number, folio, side, and line number. I have not indicated the line breaks in the Tibetan xylographs.

Chinese Buddhist Texts

References to the Taishō edition will be given in the following format:

T. 1234 (I) 123a12-21 (*juan* 1). This indicates the text numbered 1234 in the Taishō canon, which can be found in volume I, on page 123, register a, from line 12 to line 21, which is part of *juan* 1 of the text in question.

An asterisk (*) before Sanskrit names or terms indicates that while the name or term is not attested in Sanskrit, it can be reconstructed with reasonable certainty.

A final note on the bibliography: in conformity with the conventions of the publisher, names are alphabetized to allow easiest location. Thus de Groot is found under D, and von Hinüber under V, for instance.

This page intentionally left blank

Managing Monks

This page intentionally left blank

I

Introduction

The academic study of Buddhism, ideally speaking, constitutes the quest to comprehend Buddhist culture in its entirety. Since that culture, however, spans millennia in time and continents in expanse, it is not easy to conceive of its overall unity in concrete terms. If the precise definition of Buddhism in its entirety as a unified tradition is not obvious, so too there is no simple or single answer to the parallel question of what it means to be a Buddhist. In fact, for most traditional Buddhists in any time and place, being a Buddhist has not been a choice, nor something reflected upon, and therefore the question of what it means to be a Buddhist is one rarely raised. Thais and Japanese, even today, are for the most part Buddhists by virtue of being Thai and Japanese. What is it that distinguishes one as a Buddhist, and is it even meaningful to ask this question of societies in which everyone, or almost everyone, might be so classified? As we know, in cultures without knowledge of other traditions, there are not even names for the native tradition; there is no need to distinguish something when there is nothing to distinguish it from. What is implicit, tacit and not optional, and for which no alternative can be imagined, calls for no special recognition.

Although this scenario may correctly characterize the status of Buddhism in some places such as Thailand and Japan for much of their history, such was, of course, not the case with Buddhism in India, the land of its birth. Indian Buddhism developed and grew in an environment already rich in various traditions, predominantly

Brahmanical and what we now call "Hindu," but filled with numberless other local and translocal systems as well. And unlike what occurred in places such as Tibet or Japan where, once introduced, Buddhism so overshadowed the native cults that they almost ceased to exist, save as variant forms of Buddhism, all of our evidence suggests that Buddhism was never more than one option (or series of options) in the grand Indian bazaar. Moreover, even in regions more monolithically Buddhist than was ancient India, Buddhism itself was not monolithic. There were, nevertheless, at least two basic ways for one to be a Buddhist. In lands within the traditional cultural sphere of Buddhism, at least in theory a butcher, baker, or candle-stick maker, by default a "Buddhist" in virtually all cases, even if he could not have thought of himself in such terms, did have the choice to make a positive commitment to a devoutly Buddhist career by becoming a Buddhist monk, thereby forsaking his life and position in the secular world for a monastic existence.[1] The two most fundamental modes of Buddhist identification, then, are as a lay follower (whether tacitly or through some type and degree of formal commitment) and as a monk or nun. Whether such freedom of choice really existed in socially conservative environments with implacable peer pressure, concretized social hierarchies, family or financial expectations, and so on is another matter. The essential structural fact is the existence of the monastic profession, a form of being Buddhist that was different from the default mode of tacit belonging, and the corresponding possibility for an individual to devote him- or herself to the Buddhist life as a vocation.[2]

In this light, we may divide the question of what it means to be a Buddhist into two: what does it mean to be a lay Buddhist, and what does it mean to be a Buddhist monastic? To be sure, these two questions cannot be entirely isolated from one another, and for the first in particular there may be no good general answer. It may very well be that Buddhism as it is found in multiple places and times becomes so very particularized that translocal generalizations are nearly meaningless. Is the same true for the question of what it means to be a Buddhist monk? Answers will differ in important respects from most possible responses to the question of what it means to be a Buddhist to begin with. What is more, while the question of what it means to be a Buddhist at all may be a modern question, made possible only by post-Enlightenment reflections on tradition and more modern reflections on belonging, the question of what it means to be a Buddhist monk is not a new question. Taken generally, it is also,

1. The same applies, theoretically, to women as well.

2. There is, of course, also an intermediate position, the state of being an avowed "lay disciple," *upāsaka* or *upāsikā*. Just how this status was really understood in India has yet to be fully explicated.

like the broader question from which we have extracted it, not a question with only a single answer, or even a single meaning.[3]

A pair of examples from modern times may help us to frame our inquiry. In early modern Japan, questions surrounding the status of the monkhood generated a furious debate captured by the expression *nikujiki saitai* 肉食妻帯, "[the problem of] meat eating and [clerical] marriage." While the term *nikujiki* is something of an emblem, referring broadly to secular behaviors, the word *saitai* points toward what many would see as the heart of the monastic vocation, the maintenance of celibacy. This, indeed, is the concern of the very first rule listed in the core set of monastic vows, the Prātimokṣa, and the subject of a large number of additional monastic rules: monks are expected not to engage in sexual activity, period. Modern Japanese Buddhist priests—it is hard to call them monks—marry, have families, and pass down their temples from father to son like a family business, but the struggles which led up to this transformation reveal much about what some Buddhist monks at the dawn of the modern era thought it meant to be monks.[4] It is interesting and important to notice here the focus of this Japanese debate, which has nothing whatsoever to do with questions such as the importance of meditation, scholarship, or ritual performance, activities frequently associated with the ideal image of the Buddhist monk.

A debate of another kind has taken place in recent decades in Sri Lanka, where it calls forth vigorous, even violent, expressions of opinion.[5] There, the question is not one of clerical marriage or secular behaviors in the abstract, nor again of the status of meditation or scholarship or ritual, but rather of a particular type of monastic involvement in the secular world, especially in politics. Most broadly put, the key question brought to the fore in the Sri Lankan case is this: just what obligations do monks have to the lay world? One aspect of this question might be highlighted in cross-cultural terms as follows: does an idea like the Jewish concept of *tikkun olam*, the healing of the world understood by rabbinic tradition as a call to social responsibility through a religious obligation to improve this life here on earth, have a place in monastic Buddhism?[6]

3. For a look at one recent and essentially postmodern American attempt to come to grips with the question, see the tale of the San Francisco Zen Center as told in Downing 2001.

4. This history is fascinatingly explored by Jaffe 2001.

5. See among a large literature the very interesting, though disturbing and depressing, study of Seneviratne 1999.

6. This is, of course, quite a different question from the worldly benefits to be obtained from the practice of Buddhism, referred to in Japanese as *genze riyaku*.

It is not our place to judge Buddhist traditions. Nevertheless, in the two cases just mentioned, Buddhist institutional engagement with the secular world has not always brought laudable results. In the Sri Lankan case, the aggressive social and political involvement of some monks has led, in some cases, to terribly sad results, as these "renunciants" veered into racist and violent entanglements which brought about, and continue to bring about, real-world death and immense suffering. The case in modern Japan is almost a mirror image of the Sri Lankan situation. The Japanese clergy is notable for its generally passive abstention from social welfare activities.[7] Such a stance is, of course, from a normative standpoint, traditional. But the reasons for this distance in modern Japan are not and cannot be traditional ones. The traditional logic for monastic distance from the laity was that, through their strict adherence to the norms of the monastic codes, monks made themselves into repositories of merit. As such, the monks, isolated from ordinary secular community life, nevertheless provided an indirect service by offering the laity an opportunity to generate merit through donations. The symbiotic relationship functioned through the logic of donation, purity, and merit.[8] In Japan, the modern-day clergy does not provide an opportunity for the generation of merit, classically speaking, since Japanese clerics, the priests, are not traditionally ordained monks.

How might a hypothetical Indian Buddhist monk have imagined the limits of the monastic vocation? To be sure, there was never only one Indian answer to this question, any more than there was one answer to the general questions of Buddhist identity raised above. How energetic the discussions and arguments over this question were in the ancient past we will never know, since virtually our only sources are texts which, by their very nature, are less polemical, or at least less vociferous, than the pamphlets and tracts we see today. The classical sources lead us to imagine the debates of long ago as oriented considerably differently from those to which we are now witness. While the arguments in modern Sri Lanka concern, broadly speaking, whether and if so how the monk should relate to and be of service to the lay world, including even his possible role in such matters as politics and military activity, many ancient Indian Buddhist sources appear to take it almost as a given that the monk has little or no proper role whatsoever in serving the laity, and no

7. I leave out of consideration here the political involvement of organizations such as the Sōka Gakkai and its political arm, the Kōmeitō. The Sōka Gakkai is, in any case, an entirely lay movement (even assuming we grant Japanese priests monastic status). Yet another aspect of the complex whole may be glimpsed in the work of Brian Victoria (1997).

8. See Silk 1994: 182–214.

involvement in government or military affairs. Most, though not all, such endeavors are quite explicitly forbidden in the normative codes of monastic conduct, the Vinayas. Naturally, the inclusion of rules prohibiting some behavior should not lead us to presume that such things never took place—nor necessarily the contrary, that rules indicate the actual existence of particular problems.[9] Moreover, the monastic codes not infrequently contain what at least superficially appear to be contradictions in this respect, as in many others. Buddhist literature, including monastic codes and texts of other genres, delights in tales of the influence of monks on royalty and the corresponding patronage received by the monastic community from kings and princes.[10] For the latter there is certainly some concrete evidence, for example, in the cave site of Ajaṇṭā, constructed with Vākāṭaka royal patronage; and as only one example of the former, we may recall that the great poet Mātṛceṭa is credited with a didactic letter to the emperor Kaniṣka.[11] But active involvement in secular matters, not to mention engagement in social welfare activities, while it may be permitted or even, in some cases, stipulated is hardly emphasized anywhere in Indian Buddhist literature.[12]

If our sources seem to allow little scope for participation in affairs of state and the like, restrictions on such activity should not be understood to imply a disregard for, or even a simple lack of emphasis on, service per se. Rather, it is the focus of this service that is the issue. A great many sources make it abundantly clear that there was considerable opportunity for service within the monastic vocation—such service, however, being that devoted to the monastic community itself and to its members, not to the laity. From this perspective, the monk's duties were, probably unsurprisingly, understood to be first and foremost to his fellow renunciants. What such a monk simultaneously could and must provide for the laity was, above all, an opportunity for devotees to generate merit by accepting their material support from a position of spiritual purity—to use the technical terms, by being a field of merit (*puṇyakṣetra*) in

9. The logic of the rules found in the monastic codes does occasionally seem to resemble a Talmudic argument. We sometimes cannot escape the impression that monks sat around saying to each other, "Hey, what if *that* happened?! What then?" A demonstration of this belongs elsewhere.

10. On the general question, one may refer, with some reservations, to Hazra 1984.

11. See Hahn 1999. In regard to other secular activities, we recall, for instance, that the Buddhist monk Vidyākara compiled the poetic anthology *Subhāṣitaratnakoṣa*.

12. When a very common verse talks about the great merit to be gained by planting orchards, building bridges, digging wells, and (in some versions) building monasteries, it is clear that the encouragement is being given to the laity. In Buddhaghosa's commentary to the *Saṁyutta-Nikāya*, he goes so far as to explicitly say that all of these donations should be given to the monastic community. See, for example, *Saṁyutta-Nikāya* I.5.7 (Vanaropa; i.33.16–21), trans. Bodhi 2000: 122, with 377n103; T. 1 (I) 14b22–25 (*juan* 1); T. 125 (II) 596c7–10 (*juan* 10); T. 190 (III) 860c12–15 (*juan* 44); and many other places.

which planted seeds (in the form of donations) yield good fruits (in the form of karmically positive rebirths and so on).

A failure to appreciate this distinction of acceptable foci of service can lead to misunderstandings. It has been claimed, for example, that Indian monk-healers and monasteries from the mid-third century B.C.E. "extended medical care to the population at large."[13] Unfortunately for this thesis, what is supplied as evidence of a Buddhist concern to offer medical treatment to those outside the monastic community is the famous Second Rock Edict of the emperor Aśoka.[14] In this edict, provision is indeed made for medical care, tree planting, well digging,[15] and so on—all, no doubt, great public goods. But the crucial point here is precisely that this provision is being made by the king, which is to say by the government, and not by the monastic community or even by any individual monk. This cannot be understood, then, to offer evidence for any monastic involvement in the provision of health care for the general populace, nor for involvement in any other such social welfare efforts. That Aśoka may have been, in some sense, a Buddhist (though certainly never a monk) cannot be taken to mean that his royal and governmental efforts to promote social welfare may be credited to the Buddhist monastic community. A further claim in the same source is equally problematic: "A sixth-century C.E. inscription from the Duḍḍavihāra in Gujarāt, stating that the use of medicines and remedies was for all those who are sick, not only for the monks, lends support to this claim." Again, unfortunately, this suggestion that a grant to a Buddhist monastery[16] in Valabhī included provision for the sponsorship of public health promotion is based on a misreading of a stock phrase common in a great many such inscriptions, in which a part of the proceeds of a grant to the monastic community is directed to be used for the provision of medicines for monks resident in the monastery.[17] Here

13. Zysk 1991: 44.

14. A handy translation of the relevant passage may be found in Nikam and McKeon 1959: 64.

15. We may also notice that there do not seem to be any known cases in India of wells, which sometimes carry donative inscriptions, donated by monks, although as shown by Schopen 1988–1989, for instance, they did donate large numbers of images and other objects. Notice, however, that the *Śayanāsanavastu* of the Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya indicates that wells which were donated by a lay donor were nevertheless administered by monks, who were required to allow common access, mentioned by Schopen 2000b: 182nXI.10.

16. Throughout this volume, I more or less mechanically render *vihāra* and its equivalents in Tibetan and Chinese as "monastery," intentionally avoiding the question of whether this is always the most appropriate rendering. The term appears capable of denoting anything from a monastic cell or very primitive hut up to a massive "monastic city" such as Nālandā.

17. Zysk relies on Barua 1969: 62; what Barua himself says, quite correctly, in reference to two inscriptions and quoting the translations of their editor, Bühler, is that they make provision for "medicine for the sick" and "remedies and medicines for the sick." The context of both inscriptions is provision to a monastery for its upkeep and for the worship and maintenance of its inmates. Barua's sole comment which might lead to

too there is no evidence of any provision of health care for the general populace. In fact, once we are aware of the context, we see that the case is rather precisely the opposite: monks, by virtue of their place in the monastic community, gain particular access to resources almost certainly *not* generally available to the populace. The monasteries may have been havens for the ill but, at least on this evidence, only if the ill were already members of the monastic communities.[18]

It is well known that a number of professions are explicitly prohibited to monks in the monastic codes. Although he did not address the question from the same point of view as we now consider it, more than a century ago Léon Feer asked why the Buddha might have forbidden monks to engage in such practices as divination.[19] Why, he wondered, if divination were true, would the Buddha deprive himself of a legitimate means of influence, and moreover why would he refuse important services to the public? Following this logic, Feer concluded that the Buddha saw divination as nothing more than trickery. Without necessarily disagreeing with this particular conclusion, I would suggest that there is something wrong with Feer's set of assumptions here: *pace* Feer, the Buddha, as the texts present him, is not in fact interested in providing a public service, in the sense in which we commonly use those words. The way of the world, the assumed and correct ordering of society, is that people are to serve and support the monks, and not the other way around. Whether the Buddha, or those responsible for crafting the picture we have of him, might have seen divination as trickery is another issue, but even if they did not so view it, it should be clear that any assumption requiring the Buddha or monastic Buddhists to be concerned with the provision of public service is highly problematic. This disclaimer cannot be entirely categorical, of course. Monks clearly had obligations to their own families and specific obligations to be present at, if not also actually participate in, some secular life-cycle events, such as weddings or the construction and consecration of homes—all activities directed toward the wider social and societal good.[20] The fact remains,

misunderstanding is his conclusion, "The purpose of such gifts, therefore, was not only religious but also humanitarian." For the grants, see Bühler 1875a (plate II, l. 7: *piṇḍapātaglānabheṣajacīvarādy°*), 1875b (l. 9: *°śayyāsanaglānapratyayabhaiṣajyādy°*).

18. This conclusion is only reinforced by the provision in the limitations on monastic ordination that those who are ill are not to be ordained. The availability of health care within the monastery for its members made it imperative to prevent those with what would now be called "preexisting conditions" from joining the community for the purpose of gaining access to this care. See also, on the general question, Sasaki 1996.

19. Feer 1893: 66–67.

20. See Schopen 1992b on the obligation of monks to participate in a variety of secular ritual and life-cycle events, as stipulated in the Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya.

however, that monastic duties were seen as essentially oriented toward the monastic community itself.

In the following inquiry, we will also not enter into the issue of the idealized images of the helpful bodhisattvas of Mahāyāna Buddhist cosmology, who promise to aid any and all in times of distress. Figures such as Avalokiteśvara in the *Saddharmapuṇḍarīka* or the bodhisattvas discussed in Asaṅga's *Bodhisattvabhūmi* have been characterized by Donald Lopez as "cosmic social worker[s], not merely seeking the ultimate spiritual welfare of sentient beings but providing for their most immediate, existential needs."[21] This is quite true as far as it goes, but its relevance for the present inquiry is practically nil; this cosmic world of the imagination has nothing demonstrable to do with the real world, at any time or place, other than to illustrate some awareness among the authors of such texts that real people have real, immediate needs in this world. A conclusion we might draw from this, namely, that this insight led these authors to encourage monastic involvement in the remediation of such troubles, is unsupported by evidence. Rather, it seems that they left healing the world as a task for the (from a rationalist point of view, imaginary) bodhisattvas. This is a fairly common pattern: some conclusions we as moderns might draw from certain principles enunciated in Buddhist texts were simply not drawn either by the authors of those texts or by their successors in the tradition.[22] That the Buddhist traditions, including those of the Mahāyāna, as a rule did not develop practical ethical systems which might work to ameliorate the genuine suffering of the world is an issue well worth studying.[23] Our concern here, however, is not with what was not but might have been, but rather with what actually was. Leaving aside what also may have been the expectation of service and action placed upon others, we will direct our attention in the following to the issue of the expectations that were placed upon the professional or vocational Buddhists, the monks.[24]

21. Lopez 1988: 195. He refers to Dutt 1966: 100–102 = Wogihara 1936a: 144ff. Cf. the translation in Tatz 1986: 53ff.

22. An example may be seen in Kajiyama 1982: 69. He states: "Being a philosophy of non-distinctionism, the philosophy of emptiness absolutely negates discrimination between men and women." This may be true from the standpoint of first principles, but there is no evidence that it was ever understood in this way by anyone in the premodern world and plenty of practical evidence that it was not. Another example might concern the environmental ethics now being worked out by some modern Buddhists, which have been compared with historical precedents with great scholarship and sensitivity by Schmithausen 1991, 1997, and in a number of other studies.

23. As an overgeneralization, one might even say that Buddhist institutions showed little interest even in remedying the social ills they themselves caused or to which they contributed. On this, see as one example Bodiford 1996.

24. To my regret, a limitation of this book is its almost total disregard of nuns and their institutions. This is due to the nature of the sources, and the necessary limits on this study, not to any evaluation that the

What, if not social service, was expected and required of them? In other words, then, we return to our question of what it meant to be a Buddhist monk in India.

A superficial reading of the varieties of Indian Buddhist literature available today in English translation would probably lead to an impression that the ideal vocation of the monk imagined by the authors of such texts was that of a solitary meditator, wrapped in his own world of contemplation and virtually oblivious to his material environment (which, in any case, he is encouraged to view as illusory). He is made virtuous through his strict adherence to the restrictions imposed on him by the monastic code, and spiritually empowered through his meditative achievements. Even a much more careful reading which includes a wider range of sources would probably tend, on the whole, to lead one toward the same overall impression. The life of the vocational Buddhist is a life of meditative concentration leading, ideally, to awakening. The stage for this concentration is set by the context of a rigid system of prohibitions, which guide the meditator to guard his every action externally while he guards his every thought internally. And while this picture of the ideal life is more often assumed than actually argued for in this literature, frequently being simply taken for granted, there do exist sources which appear to take the conclusion that this is the one and only proper monastic vocation as something less than an absolute given, in that they explicitly raise and discuss the question. An investigation of some of these materials might allow us a peek into a world of ideas somewhat more dynamic than a cursory examination might have led us to expect.

The picture of monks as solely devoted to meditation and the pursuit of true "religious experience" has modern sources as well, some of which seem to have almost self-consciously promoted this image. This modern construction has recently been energetically challenged. Robert Sharf, in a sharp attack on the category of "experience" and drawing examples from Theravāda and Chan/Zen traditions, has observed, "In fact, contrary to the image propagated by twentieth-century apologists, the actual practice of what we would call meditation rarely played a major role in Buddhist monastic life."[25] Largely in agreement with Sharf, Janet Gyatso has extended this critique in remarking on the situation in Tibet as follows:[26]

---

matter is of lesser interest or importance. I earnestly hope that parallel studies of nuns and nunneries may be undertaken soon.

25. Sharf 1995: 241.

26. Gyatso 1999: 116.

> Sharf . . . would correct the mistaken impression that "what Buddhists do" is meditate and [he maintains] instead that Buddhists cultivate experience in meditation far less frequently than has commonly been supposed. This is the case for virtually all Tibetan Buddhists, who occupy the greater part of their time in ritual assemblies, monastic administration, academic study, the production of religious texts and implements, and various kinds of menial labor.

If, then, the contemporary situation, and much of what we can learn of less recent periods, does not reflect an idealized model which asserts the primacy of meditation, what of classical Indian materials? Is meditation the only, or if not that then the most valuable, valid and true vocation of the monk? There is no shortage of classical literary sources which imply so. At the same time, the monastic community, the *saṁgha*, is a community, which naturally requires that it possess a corresponding organization. Organization, in turn, requires administration; no organization can function without administration of some form or another. If we wish, then, to understand the range of possible vocations of a monk, which is one of the things we must do if we wish to understand what it means to be a monk at all, a few questions we must ask are how the monastic community of ancient India was organized and how administered, and how involvement in such administration was viewed and valued.[27] No doubt, we must expect multiple varieties and degrees of administrative and managerial involvement. Did monks simply direct the activities of others, employees or servants perhaps? Or did monks (also) engage directly in some or several types of service activities? Who qualified for such service, and what did it involve? How was such service seen, and how valued? These are not easy questions to answer.

It is a disappointing fact that we as yet know very little about the realities of Buddhism in classical India. While we are amply provided with studies on

27. We need not discuss here some putative earlier stage in the development of Buddhist monasticism in which monks roamed individually and obtained all of the requisites for their maintenance directly from donors. For our intents and purposes, at least, the only strata of the tradition to which we have access are those characterized by a settled monasticism, communal living, and, thus, organized systems of distribution and administration. Naturally, there will be differences among such systems, which we may never be able to unravel, but we cannot, I believe, and in any case we need not even speculate as to whether some period of precommunal monasticism even existed, much less how it may have functioned from an administrative or bureaucratic point of view.

It is a different question to what degree the Buddhist monastic institution was rationalized at any given time in any given place. Gregory Schopen in a long series of studies has sought to explore the ways in which the Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya reflects a quite organized institution. Here, we can approach only a small part of this problem. (It may be of some interest in the future to try to apply to this problem the ideas of Ekelund et al. 1996.)

so-called dependent origination, or the complexities of the emptiness or Tathāgatagarbha doctrines, we are much less well informed about an average day's events at an Indian Buddhist monastery or hermitage of virtually any time or place in the classical period, or the bureaucratic structure of such institutions; our relatively good information on multiple supramundane or abstract aspects of the Indian Buddhist world of thought is mirrored by our comparative ignorance about the mundane details of the day-to-day life of Indian Buddhist monasticism (not to mention the life of nonmonastic Buddhists).[28] In part, there is good reason for this. Much more than might be the case with abstract doctrinal ideas, we expect a considerable localization and regionalization of both the practices and the terminology of monastic organization. Even when the terminology for administrators and administrative roles from diverse sources appears prima facie to coincide, it is a good working hypothesis that the respective referents of the same term differ, perhaps significantly. In this regard, it may be useful to reflect on our own uses of terms such as "manager." The manager of a baseball team and the manager of a fast-food restaurant share a job title and administrative responsibility, broadly speaking, but they do not do the same tasks and do not have the same status, either within their respective organizations or in society at large. Add to this the stage manager at the ballet, the pop music star's business manager, and the bank manager, and we may have some sense of the possible flexibility of such vocabulary—even leaving aside the problem of chronological and regional differences. Now, it

28. We are much better served for some other geographical and cultural areas. For ancient Sri Lanka we have the superb study of Gunawardana 1979 (esp. 95–153), while for later imperial China we have Welch 1967, and Prip-Møller 1937: 353–384. For the earlier Chinese situation, see Gernet 1956, and now Yifa 2002. For medieval Japanese Zen, see Collcutt 1981: 221–247 (and see the translation of Dōgen's *Eihei Shingi* in Leighton and Okumura 1996), and for modern Korea, Buswell 1992: 203–216. Part of the reason for this imbalance is resources. As Gunawardana 1979: 135 has quite clearly stated, "In the whole of South Asia it is only in Sri Lanka that such detailed evidence on the economic aspects of monastic life and the administrative organization of Buddhist monasteries is available." China, Japan, and Korea are likewise rich in resources for the historian.

As yet, few scholars have chosen to take advantage of the tremendous collective memory of those who might inform us of the details of Tibetan monastic life and organization before 1959. While every year these potential informants grow older, it does appear that access to documents in Tibetan collections may be growing easier. Both forms of testimony are of vital importance.

With regard again to the Indian situation, we may note that, although Hindu monasticism came into existence relatively late, and even then was not particularly influential, earlier Jainism and Buddhism were virtual contemporaries. Comparative studies of Jaina and Buddhist institutions would be most welcome. The comparative project is somewhat complicated by the much more coherent Jaina ideology, which sought to enforce a true homelessness and material poverty on its monks essentially unparalleled in Buddhism. When possible, in this book, I have referred to the little I have been able to learn about Jaina institutions. A not entirely satisfying attempt to compare Jaina and Buddhist monastic administration (the Buddhist material based entirely on Pāli sources) is found in Prasad 1972: 199–212. See also Deo 1956: 216–226, 368–371, 443–444.

might be possible to argue that Indian discussions of abstract doctrinal questions from different sources may in some sense still be presumed to be participating in one large conversation, even when we move beyond the naive assumption that the conversation somehow takes place synchronically. Moreover, this may be so even when we pass out of India altogether; there is, for example, some justification for considering the views of the fourteenth-century Tibetan scholar Tsong kha pa along with those of the second-century Indian Nāgārjuna when investigating the logic and dynamics of Madhyamaka thought.[29] However, the same quite clearly and unambiguously cannot be the case with discussions of monastic organizations, which are de facto localized and chronologically delimited.[30]

Noticing non-Indian materials for their comparative value is another matter, of course, and potentially of great interest, but for different reasons and toward different ends. If we believe that Chinese Buddhism and Japanese Buddhism, for example, mean something different from Buddhism in China and Buddhism in Japan, in the sense that the former expressions highlight the inculturations of these respective traditions, then we must naturally acknowledge that the details of Indian Buddhism are not directly applicable to other cultural climates any more than the details of Chinese or Japanese Buddhism are directly applicable to the Indian case. On the other hand, insofar as Chinese Buddhism is Buddhism, contiguous with the foundational traditions of India, it will significantly assist us in understanding its nature to be able to compare this Buddhism and its particular features with the facts of the Buddhism of India. How to account for the differences one finds becomes then the central question—but without a firmly grounded picture of the Indian situation in the first place, it will be impossible to detect what might be later and non-Indian innovations or adaptations. Such studies have been carried out with respect to doctrinal questions virtually from the beginning days of modern Buddhist studies,[31] but in the arena of the practical, research again lags behind.

Another constraint on our investigation comes from the sheer scope of the potential source materials. Even assuming a synchronic point of view, with its attendant dangers of conflation, it is quite impossible to survey here all that

29. I am entirely in sympathy with critiques such as those of Huntington 1995 and 2003, which stress the need to nuance our readings of this material and to deconstruct the illusion of a coherent "Indo-Tibetan Buddhism." At the same time, I also find generally illuminating and instructive the contrast between philosophical inquiry and the details of administrative structures.

30. For one attempt to begin a general investigation of monastic life in India, see Schopen 2000a: 227–294 (available so far only in Japanese).

31. For a good example, see Schopen 1984.

might be learned from literary and inscriptional sources about the organization of daily life, the routines of monks, and how ordinary affairs were carried out in Buddhist monasteries in classical India. Indeed, a comprehensive exploration of even the seemingly narrower topic of administration would, at the very least, entail a thoroughgoing examination of all the extant (quite voluminous, and largely unexplored) monastic codes,[32] not to mention their related ancillary literature, again clearly an impossible task at present. This is so because everything that the codes of monastic conduct discuss may be seen to bear in some way or another, even if only theoretically, on the daily life of the monks and nuns. Every ecclesiastical procedure (*karman*), for example, requires the participation of some monastic administrator, whether or not he has a specific and distinct title, and by definition involves or constitutes an administrative process. In the end, therefore, a truly comprehensive study of administrators and administrative roles involves perforce an exhaustive study of the Vinayas in their entirety, although it must not be limited to these sources.

Our inscriptional sources are also tantalizing, but ultimately insufficient. For example, quite obviously the management of funds such as those that inscriptions inform us were placed in perpetual endowments (*akṣayanīvi*) presupposes not simply administrators, but skilled or at least competent financial managers. While we have no good evidence that the holdings of Buddhist monastic establishments in India gave rise to the type of proto-capitalism Gernet has suggested arose out of such institutions in medieval China,[33] there is substantial evidence for the sometimes considerable landed wealth of Buddhist monasteries, for example those in the particularly well-documented region of Valabhī, in present-day Gujarat. There, under the Maitrakas, Buddhist monasteries had significant land holdings—yet, so far, we know next to nothing about how such holdings were administered. Given these constraints, the present study can be nothing more than a general introduction to select aspects of a much greater question, or set of questions, based upon a severely restricted range of sources. I believe it is not, for this, pointless, but only incomplete and tentative.

Toward our limited goal, then, we will begin by trying to understand one fundamental tension within monastic ideology, namely, that concerning the rightful place of service. Having established the variety of opinion that exists

32. Extant in Pāli, Sanskrit, Chinese, and Tibetan, mostly untranslated in modern languages, mostly unedited, mostly unindexed.

33. See Gernet 1956. Whether it is really appropriate to call what arose in China proto-capitalism is another matter (on which, inter alia, see Silk 1999).

on this point in a range of Indian Buddhist texts of different provenances, we will turn to more detailed investigations, the goal of which will be to seek a more precise understanding of the meaning and reference of several terms for monastic administrators or functionaries. We will explore what might have been expected of such individuals, what their responsibilities were, and the status accorded to them. We will see that, as we might perhaps expect, Vinaya sources provide the bulk of our evidence. In addition, the majority of our materials will be drawn from the literature of the Mūlasarvāstivāda and Theravāda sects, although the reason for this comes rather from accidents of history than from some basic intention. Since the fundamental bases of our particular investigations rest on the specification of particular terminological usages, we must perforce have constant resort to Indic language sources. Translations, as we will see, do not allow us to reconstruct Indic terminology with adequate accuracy. Thanks to the vagaries of history, we have available to us today very little material in Indic languages that does not belong to one of these two sects, the literatures of which are preserved in, respectively, Sanskrit and Pāli. Otherwise, the Vinayas of the Dharmaguptaka, Mahāsāṁghika, Sarvāstivāda, and Mahīśāsaka sects are extant, with fragmentary exceptions, only in Chinese.[34] We will inquire into how far we may go in making use of Chinese, or even the comparatively more precise Tibetan, translations for this sort of study and conclude that while broad patterns can certainly be detected, any sort of argument which requires some certainty of the Indic form of a term is out of the question when one's sources exist only in Chinese (and to a lesser extent, even Tibetan). A final question we will consider is whether there is any particular Mahāyāna ideology relevant to the questions we are investigating. This is a question which arises because, as we will see in a moment, the central issue which motivated this study in the first place arose from an attempt to understand the depiction of monastic administration in a Mahāyāna sūtra.

34. I leave aside the minor Vinaya works of the Kāśyapīyas and Sammatīyas, also available only in Chinese.

2

The Tension between Service and Practice

There is a broad variety of opinion on the propriety of involvement in monastic administration. How may administration be compared to other possible activities in which a monk might engage? In other words, to revert for a moment to our initial question, if we determine that one, or the paradigmatic, way of being a Buddhist is to be a monk, we must next ask what the most representative form of monkhood is. What does the paradigmatic monk look like? And once we frame this question in terms of the activities to which a monk might devote himself, we see the issue emerge in our sources in the form of a tension. Three principal courses appear: devotion to service, devotion to study and preaching, and devotion to meditation and personal cultivation, to the physical, the intellectual, and the contemplative, so to speak. An example of what may be the most radical stance is that taken by the author(s) of a Mahāyāna scripture, the *Ākāśagarbha-sūtra*,[1] in which we find a thoroughgoing rejection of administrative involvement and even study or preaching in favor of meditative practice:[2]

1. For a summary of the sūtra, see De Visser 1931: 18–27. For the history of the text, see Matsumoto 1927: 133–142, 164–169; Hatani 1934; Ōno 1954: 290–291, 303–304. Less satisfactory is the more recent discussion of Komine Michihiko and Itō Gyōkan in Katsuzaki et al. 1997: 345–347, whose references include none of the significant previous scholarship.

2. Textual Materials 1. I translate here the Sanskrit quotation of the passage in the *Śikṣāsamuccaya*. Hakamaya 1999: 155–156 has emended the Sanskrit text, as he notes (168n49), but he nowhere cites the actual readings of the *Śikṣāsamuccaya*.

> The meditation monk is a good field [of merit], not those who resort to study [*adhyayana*] or service [*vaiyāpṛtya*],[3] nor those who are absorbed in study. Those who are true vessels with respect to the subjects of the concentrations, mnemonic formulae and patient tolerance,[4] worthy of reverence, worthy of gifts, illuminators of the world, showers of the path—they save beings from the field of action and the field of defilements, and establish them in the path that leads to nirvāṇa.

Here, it is meditation (*dhyāna*) which is accepted as the only monastic vocation worthy of respect, with even study, not to mention service, subordinated.[5]

Immediately preceding the quoted passage, we read (MS 38a1; Bendall 1897–1902: 64.8–10): *yas tatra prahāṇikānāṁ bhikṣūṇām upabhogaparibhogas taṁ svādhyāyābhiratānāṁ bhikṣūṇāṁ niryātayaṁti | te ubhayato mūlāpattim āpadyante, tat kasya hetoḥ*. Thus, the *dhyāyin bhikṣu* is equated with the *prahāṇika bhikṣu*, and the *adhyayana* with the *svādhyāya*. There is no counterpart to *vaiyāpṛtya* in the preceding. Hakamaya 1999: 172 corrects his error of p. 156 that *prahāṇika* and *svādhyāyābhirata* should be seen as an alternative expression to *adhyayanāvaiyāpṛtyāśrita*.

3. As I will discuss below, in many contexts this word might be better rendered "administration," but for the time being it may be best to employ the conservative translation "service."

4. Hakamaya 1999: 168n52, notes, "I have translated *samādhi-dhāraṇī-kṣānti-bhūmi* with the Tibetan translation, interpreting all the terms as having a *dvandva* relation, but I suppose it is also possible to understand each of the first three terms with *bhūmi*." In fact, had Hakamaya noticed the other translations of this passage, namely, the Tibetan and Chinese of the *Śikṣāsamuccaya* and the Chinese translations of the sūtra itself, he would have found evidence supporting his speculation. (Since he has referred in nn. 49 and 53 to the Tibetan translation of the *Śikṣāsamuccaya* and one Chinese translation of the sūtra, it is odd that he did not draw attention to them in this regard.)

The Tibetan translation of the sūtra itself has *bsam gtan pa dag ni ting nge 'dzin dang | gzungs dang | bzod pa dang sa dag la snod du gyur pa*. The translation of the *Śikṣāsamuccaya* has *ting nge 'dzin dang gzungs dang bzod pa'i sa rnams kyi snod du gyur pa*, while the Chinese version of that text has 三昧總持諸忍諸地之器. Three Chinese translations of the sūtra render the phrase as follows: T. 405: 忍辱三昧法器; T. 406: 三昧陀羅尼諸忍諸地之器; T. 408: 三昧諸陀羅尼諸忍地等當作法器. Clearly, *samādhi* and *dhāraṇī* stand in a *dvandva* relation. The Tibetan translation of the sūtra itself, the Chinese rendering of the *Śikṣāsamuccaya*, and T. 406 fairly clearly seem to understand four items: *samādhi* and *dhāraṇī* and *kṣānti* and *bhūmi*, while the other versions are more ambiguous. Another issue is what *bhūmi* means here, if it is not a reference to (the?) *kṣāntibhūmi*. Hakamaya evades the issue, as Japanese scholars almost habitually do, by merely adopting as a "translation" the Chinese term *dì* (Jpn. *ji*) 地. I have tentatively understood it in the sense of "subject."

5. I am not sure whether I have misunderstood Hakamaya 1999: 156 or he has misconstrued the text. But what the sūtra says is this: some Kṣatriyas in a future time will patronize the wrong group of monks, those who are not upright in their practice and so on. Correspondingly, they will cause trouble for the good monks, referred to as *prahāṇābhiyukta bhikṣu* or *prahāṇika* (here, roughly, meditators). They will corrupt and think ill of those monks, and transfer their wealth and possessions to the *svādhyāyābhirata bhikṣus* (here, roughly, reciters). Both of these actions constitute a "root sin," *mūlāpatti*. In the *Śikṣāsamuccaya* manuscript, the expression "both of these" is given the marginal gloss *abrahmacāribhikṣavo 'varṇṇavādāt paribhogacyāvanā ca*, which may mean "noncelibate monks (who claim to be celibate) because they are criticized and those who cause the removal of property." Note in one translation of the sūtra, T. 408 (XIII) 674a27, the expression 彼等二人悉犯重罪, "those two people both commit serious crimes." Apparently in this context, "those two people" means bad monks and kṣatriyas and their followers—or only the latter two?

Hakamaya's starting point for his discussion here is a list of sixty-four types of persons in the *Yogācārabhūmi* (discussed below), in which indeed we find the series: *prahāṇika*, *svādhyāyakāraka*, and *vaiyāvṛtyakara*. The importance of this sequence is not clear to me, but I cannot agree with many of the suggestions made by

The text explicitly links its valuation of meditation to the meditator's ability to produce merit for devotees, insisting that only the meditator is a field of merit (*puṇyakṣetra*), but not scholars or those engaged in service, which may be to say, administrators. Patronage of a meditator will yield great karmic results for the donor because of the meditator's fitness to receive such donations, this not being true for the reciter-scholar or service monk. The superiority of the meditator, and corresponding inferiority of scholars and service monks, is thus also conceived of here as an economic issue, or at least to have economic aspects as well. For the author(s) of the *Ākāśagarbha-sūtra*, patronage directed to meditators will generate the best "rate of return" for the donor, a clearly rational appeal to the enlightened self-interest of such potential donors. Equally strident in a different way is another Mahāyāna scripture, the *Adhyāśayasaṁcodana-sūtra*:[6]

> And I announce to you, Maitreya, I declare to you: Those who have no yoga, no meditative concentration, no strong effort, no study, no quest for learning,[7] are not bodhisattvas ordained in the Tathāgata's instruction. Moreover, Maitreya, the Tathāgata's instruction is rich in meditative concentration and strong effort, perfected in wisdom, concentrated in wisdom, rich in energetic exertion. It is not rich in the employment and service [suitable to] householders [*gṛhikarmāntavaiyāpṛtya*]. For this action—namely, service fixed on worldly tasks—belongs to those whose yoga is misapplied, who delight in transmigration. It is not toward this that a bodhisattva must generate his desire.
>
> Even if, Maitreya, a bodhisattva delighted with service were to fill these three times many thousands of world-realms with stūpas made of the seven jewels, I would not be pleased by that, not honored, not respected. Maitreya, if a bodhisattva were even to memorize only one

Hakamaya regarding the roles and status of these individuals, claims for which in general he provides no evidence at all. For example, he states (1999: 157) that the *svādhyāyakāraka* was a low-status monk who, on account of his good voice, recited scriptures for the laity gathered at the stūpa for some ritual. This is speculation pure and simple.

Incidentally, although this is not the place to enter into an elaborate examination of the *Ākāśagarbha-sūtra* or even of this passage, we should note that what the Sanskrit quotation and Tibetan translation have as *prahāṇika*, one Chinese translation (T. 408 [XIII] 674a23–24) takes as **āraṇyaka* and **viveka* (?*kōngxián* 空閑) monks, but later (674a26) as *jīngjìn bǐqiū* 精進比丘 (**vīrya* bhikṣu).

6. Textual Materials 2. I translate from the Tibetan, but a large portion is quoted in the *Śikṣāsamuccaya*, and my translation of this portion naturally takes careful account of the Sanskrit. In addition, the passage is also cited in the *Sūtrasamuccaya* (Pāsādika 1989: 95.13–96.16; D 3934, *dbu ma, ki* 178b5–179a3); see also Ratnākaraśānti's commentary *Sūtrasamuccayabhāṣya Ratnālokālaṁkāra* (D 3935, *dbu ma, ki* 278a5–6), and Atiśa's *Mahāsūtrasamuccaya* (D 3961, *dbu ma, gi* 48a5–b6).

7. On this essentially formulaic pattern, see Schopen 1999: 288–289, who cites parallels from the *Maitreyamahāsiṁhanāda-sūtra* and the Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya. Numerous other parallels could no doubt also be traced.

> verse of four lines concerning the perfections, or bear it in mind, recite it, master it or explain it, he would respect, reverence, honor and worship me through that. Why? Because, Maitreya, the awakening of the Tathāgatas springs from great learning; it does not spring from concern with property [**vastuparigraha*]. If, Maitreya, a bodhisattva devoted to service were to fix a bodhisattva devoted to teaching and recitation in a fixation on service he, [though] desirous of merit, would [instead] generate a great mass of demerit, and acquire obstacles [to merit through these] actions [**karmāvaraṇa*]. Why? Because all the three objects related to meritorious action [**puṇyakriyāvastu*] arise from wisdom. Therefore, Maitreya, the bodhisattva devoted to service should not hinder the bodhisattva devoted to teaching and recitation. The whole of India might be filled with service bodhisattvas [*vaiyāpṛtyakara bodhisattva*], but all of them should serve and attend upon a single bodhisattva who is devoted to teaching and recitation. And bodhisattvas devoted to teaching and recitation as many as [might fill] the whole of India should serve and attend upon a single bodhisattva devoted to secluded meditation.

The hierarchy here is crystal clear: meditation is the proper activity of the monk. Teaching and recitation, study and scholarship, are inferior to this, but still preferable to service activity, which does not please the Buddha (the putative speaker here) and which distracts from the pursuit of liberation. Service, moreover, is linked by the author(s) here with an obsession with material objects. The service bodhisattva or administrator must frequently concern himself with the material conditions for monastic existence, the supplies of the monastery, and handle financial affairs, including managing donations of valuables. Here, however, it is insinuated that by virtue of his post he focuses his attentions solely in this direction, which leads to the conclusion that his very devotion itself would then consist of material donations, such as those to stūpas, rather than in learning or meditative contemplation. We are not in a position to question or second-guess the sincerity or good will of the authors of such arguments. Moreover, below we will meet with a number of examples from the Buddhist narrative literature of stories which express what must have been a widespread concern with fiscal impropriety on the part of those charged with fiduciary responsibilities. But the charge, or the insinuation, here in the *Adhyāśayasaṁcodana-sūtra* is different; even the honest administrator is assumed to orient his religiosity around material goods, rather than either study or meditation, and it is for this that the authors disapprove of him. There is no question here of any alleged particular impropriety or malfeasance. Rather,

administrative or service duties—even if done well—are assumed to be, if not strictly blameworthy, at least not praiseworthy either. The most positive reading we can give to this stance is to see it as a radical affirmation of the unqualified worth of meditation. But it does leave open the question of just how such practice could have functioned within an institutional or organized framework. To be sure, the text speaks here not of a monk but of a bodhisattva. The significance of this difference is not entirely clear, but we will see that other sources, not only scriptures but doctrinal treatises as well, present similar arguments with explicit reference to monks.

A hierarchy similar to that in the just-quoted passage is expressed in an extract from the *Bodhisattvabhūmi*, a portion of the massive doctrinal compendium *Yogācārabhūmi*, which discusses the causes of the initial aspiration for awakening (*prathamacittotpāda*, the initial impetus to seek buddhahood), one of which is to be fortunate in one's friends. The text states that that fortune is manifest in four aspects:[8]

> [The fourth type of fortune in friends is having a friend who] does not, having dissuaded from relatively superior qualities of faith, desire, commitment, energy and skillful means, encourage rather inferior qualities of faith, desire, commitment, energy and skillful means. For example [such a friend does not]: having dissuaded from the Great Vehicle [encourage] in the direction of the Vehicle of Auditors or the Vehicle of Lone Buddhas; having dissuaded from mental cultivation [encourage] in the direction of rational thought; having dissuaded from rational thought [encourage] in the direction of study; having dissuaded from study [encourage] in the direction of service duty [*vaiyāpr̥tyakarman*]; having dissuaded from adherence to the precepts [encourage] in the direction of charity. [Such a friend] does not, having dissuaded from relatively superior qualities according to such a classification, [encourage] in the direction of the relatively inferior qualities of the classification. This is the fourth type of fortune in friends.

Here again, the hierarchies are clear, listed in descending order: Mahāyāna > Śrāvakayāna or Pratyekabuddhayāna; meditation > rational thinking > rote learning > service;[9] precepts > charity. The implication plainly is that the most

8. Textual Materials 3.

9. Elsewhere in the same text, *vaiyāpr̥tyakriyā* seems to mean more generally any sort of service to others; see Wogihara 1936a: 29.25 = Dutt 1966: 20.13. In the Chinese (T. 1579 [XXX] 484c13 [*juan* 36]), Xuanzang translates *gòngshì* 供事, with the implication of material support.

appropriate engagement for the religious practitioner is to uphold the disciplinary rules, meditate, and be a Mahāyānist; the other options are simply inferior. Among these, engagement in administration is explicitly stated to be inferior to all three of the aspects of mental cultivation: learning, thinking, and meditating. This valuation is plainly connected with the idea that these three generate the three types of wisdom, *śrutamayī-*, *cintāmayī-*, and *bhāvanāmayī-prajñā*, while administrative activities will bear no such fruit. We see, therefore, that from the perspective of merit, as well as from the perspective of spiritual cultivation, administrative activities are considered by the texts cited so far, both Mahāyāna sūtra and śāstra, to be unequivocally inferior and even fruitless.

We do, however, find texts which display what appear to be sometimes considerably different value systems. In a passage in the *Abhisamācārika*, a section of the Mahāsāṁghika (Lokottaravāda) Vinaya fortuitously preserved in Sanskrit,[10] monks who want to be excused from work appeal on the following grounds:[11]

> The Blessed One said: "Therefore, all must behave like this with regard to beds and sitting mats." What, then, [does it mean]: "All must behave like this with regard to beds and sitting mats"? Now, these monasteries are torn apart, in bad shape, dirty, in disrepair. Then the *gaṇḍī* [gong] must be struck with a "clang clang" sound, and the entire monastic community must gather. Therefore someone might say: "I am a dharma-preacher, I am an upholder of the Vinaya, I am a wilderness dweller, I am an alms beggar, I am a wearer of refuse rag robes.[12] These contemptible little śramaṇas will do the repairs." [Speaking in that way,] they commit an infraction of the discipline.

This passage clearly implies that a prejudicial preference for one's role as a practitioner of severe practices—the examples listed are characteristic of the dhuta ascetic purification practices (*dhutaguṇa*) and thus represent the paradigmatic forms of rigorous practices for spiritual cultivation—and a corresponding denigration of those who work in support roles are not only blameworthy, but in fact a violation of monastic rules. This text does not, of course, invert the entire structure we saw above. There is no devaluation here of the practices in which the offending monk may claim to be engaged, but only a criticism of his own devaluation of the contributions of others. In addition, we should be aware that śramaṇas are not necessarily equivalent to monks, although they often are,

10. More cautiously, we might characterize the language of the text as highly Sanskritized Prakrit.

11. Textual Materials 4.

12. The closely corresponding Chinese translation, T. 1425 (XXII) 504a9–10 (*juan* 34), has this portion as follows: "I am a forest dweller, alms beggar, *dàdé* 大德 [= *bhadanta*? *ārya*?], **sthavira* [*shàngzuò* 上座]."

and so it is not necessarily a question here of one monk criticizing another. There is correspondingly not necessarily any praise being offered, even implicitly, of administration or service. Still, the passage does stand in some contrast to the explicit devaluations of administration cited above.

A different type of approach is taken in a passage from another Mahāyāna scripture, the *Sāgaramatiparipṛcchā*, which discusses the obstacles to a bodhisattva's practice. Here, as in other sources we have seen, administration or service (*vaiyāpṛtya*) consists in the duties which would distract one from solitary meditation (*viveka*). The text continues, however, in a way which suggests that the two, administrative duties and solitary meditation, are each appropriate in different circumstances, rather than subject to hierarchical ranking. The scripture says:[13]

> Again, Blessed One, a bodhisattva serves, attends upon and waits upon evil "friends" who have taken the guise of spiritual advisors. For, dissuading him from the means of attracting others to the teaching,[14] from [acquiring] the provisions of merit, dissuading him from taking hold of the True Teaching, they urge him toward few concerns and few duties.[15] And they constantly expound for him tales suitable for Auditors and Lone Buddhas.
>
> On the occasion when a bodhisattva might make progress in the Great Vehicle by dwelling in solitude, they urge that bodhisattva to fixation on service [*vaiyāpṛtya*], [saying:] "A bodhisattva must engage in service!" And on the occasion when a bodhisattva should devote himself to service, they urge him to solitude. And they address him thus: "Awakening belongs to the bodhisattva who is energetically active, not to the lazy. If you will not awaken to unexcelled perfect awakening in nine or ten aeons, you will not be able to awaken to unexcelled perfect awakening at all." But, Blessed One, in that regard a bodhisattva through extremely energetic activity knows this state which he might attain,[16] the fruit of nirvāṇa. This, Blessed One, is the tenth hook of Māra, under the guise of a spiritual advisor.

The authors of this scripture seem to accept an appropriate place for service alongside of meditation, each to be practiced in its proper context and

13. Textual Materials 5.

14. See Gómez 1987: 188n54, on the concept of the four *saṁgrahavastūni*.

15. It seems that generally the terms *alpārtha* and *alpakṛtya* have a positive sense—but compare *Kāśyapaparivarta* §13 (Staël-Holstein 1926).

16. The expression is not absolutely clear. To the Sanskrit *sthānaṁ khalu punar etad vidyate yan nirvāṇa-phalaṁ prāpnuyād* corresponds the Tibetan *'bras bu thob par bgyid pa'i gnas mchis nas*. Although Sanskrit *sthānam* could be adverbial ("truly"), the Tibetan rendering suggests that here it is not to be so taken.

apparently with equal approval. The text says that to urge a bodhisattva to engage in solitary meditation when it is appropriate for him instead to work at service (*yasmiṁś ca samaye bodhisatvo vaiyāpṛtye saṁniyojayitavyas*) is the action of Māra, the personification of evil—a strong condemnation indeed. This clear approval of the circumstantial propriety of service is very important and offers us our first good evidence that the hierarchical subordination of service or administrative involvement we encountered above is not universal. We will find that many texts appear to share this idea, even if they do not articulate it quite so explicitly as does the *Sāgaramatiparipṛcchā*. A very nice example occurs in a text which, while not Indian as such, certainly has a significant Indian basis. The so-called *Sūtra of the Wise and the Fool* was compiled in China based on stories orally transmitted in Khotan. In this text, when the Buddha's eminent disciple Śāriputra is considering whether to ordain an old man, he thinks to himself: "This old man is deficient in all three regards; he is incapable of study, meditation and assisting in the affairs of the monastic community." (By the order of the Buddha, another disciple, Maudgalyāyana, ordains the man despite his infirmity.)[17] We find another example of interest in a clearly Indian scripture, the *Karuṇapuṇḍarīka*. In this text, the bodhisattva who will eventually become Śākyamuni makes five hundred vows, including many specifications of what he will do for the sake of various sorts of persons, one of which reads:[18] "For those who do not delight in the good Teachings I will teach service activities [*vaiyāvṛtyakarmāṇi*]; for those who do delight in the preaching [of the good Teachings], I will teach exclusively emptiness, the path toward meditation and liberation." While there may be an implicit hierarchy here, it is certainly not emphasized, and it is also possible to understand the text as treating service and meditative contemplation as alternatives.

The pairing of scholastics, or the text-oriented practices of recitation and study, with meditation is a classic one in Buddhist doctrine, and their hierarchy

17. T. 202 (IV) 376c28, 377b21–22 (*juan* 4); in Tibetan (from Chinese) in S 281, *mdo sde, ci* 69a6, 71b4; edited in Schmidt 1845: 89.11, 92.11; translated (from Mongolian) in Frye 1981: 69. The crucial expression is *zuǒzhù zhòngshì* 佐助衆事, translated *dge 'dun las bya ba*. We will consider this scripture at greater length below.

18. This text no doubt requires further study. As it stands, however, the meaning of this brief passage seems basically clear. Yamada 1968: 261.18–262.2: *ye ca nābhiratāḥ kuśaleṣu dharmeṣu teṣāṁ cāhaṁ vaiyāvṛtyakarmāṇi nirdeśeyam | svādhyāyābhiratānām ekāṁśena śūnyatāṁ dhyānavimuktigāminām nirdeśayeyaṁ* |. D 112, *mdo sde, cha*, 235a1–2; S 45, *mdo sde, nga* 155a5–6: *gang dag dge ba'i chos rnams la mngon par mi dga' ba de dag la bdag gis zhal ta bgyid pa'i las ston par gyur cig | kha ton la mngon par dga' ba rnams la ni stong pa nyid kyis* [S *kyi*] *bsam gtan gyi cha gcig gis rnam par grol ba'i lam ston par gyur cig* |. T. 157 (III) 211b17–20 (*juan* 7): 若有衆生其心不樂於正善法、我當爲説營作衆事。若有衆生於正善法其心愛樂、我當爲説空三昧定示正解脱; T. 158 (III) 269c26–28 (*juan* 5): 其有不樂善法者 、我。當爲彼説勸化業。樂者我當爲説誦習一向禪空解脱.

even a cliché in some contexts, not limited to Mahāyāna sūtras. As Gregory Schopen has pointed out, Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya texts speak of "two occupations for a monk, meditation and recitation,"[19] and there are some indications that a choice must be made, that a practitioner must concentrate (if he specializes in this manner at all) on one or the other.[20] Schopen goes on to point out what he sees as a corresponding denigration of other forms of activity:[21] "the redactors of the *Mūlasarvāstivādavinaya* also used the same assertion of the twofold occupation of a monk in attempts, presumably, to curb other forms of monastic behavior which they seem to have judged unacceptable." Citing the *Kṣudrakavastu* of the Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya, Schopen then refers to a passage in which the Buddha "declares the five benefits or blessings [*anuśaṁsa*] that come from sweeping," after which "all the Elder Monks [*sthaviras*] abandon meditation and recitation" and begin sweeping.[22] The Buddha clarifies his intention as follows:[23]

> What I said referred to the monk in charge of physical properties [*upadhivārika*], not to every single Elder Monk. On the contrary, the occupation of the monk who has entered the Order of this

19. Schopen 1999: 285, quoting the expression *dve bhikṣukarmaṇī dhyānam adhyayanaṁ ca*. In context, Schopen's translation of *karma* here as "occupation" is appropriate. However, to avoid ambiguity, I would prefer "activities," to be understood certainly in the pregnant sense of "[proper, suitable] activities."

Schopen's suggestion on p. 290 that "both the assertion of the twofold occupation of a monk and the formula describing the abandonment of monastic activities are well established and of wide occurrence in the *Mūlasarvāstivādavinaya*, but such things appear to be rarely if ever found elsewhere in mahāyāna *sūtra* literature" might require reconsideration in light of the examples cited below. He states in 316n32 that this particular formula "appears to be characteristically *Mūlasarvāstivādin*."

I also have some hesitation about his suggestion that there is no connection between the dichotomy discussed here and that between meditators (*jhāyins*) and those concerned with doctrine (*dhammayoga*), or a Ceylonese distinction between scholars (*ganthadhura*) and meditators (*vipassanādhura*). This too, I believe, requires further consideration.

20. Schopen says in one place (1999: 316n32) that these two occupations of the monk are "presented as two alternatives or two possible options, and individuals are generally presented as choosing one or the other. . . . they are not (yet) mutually exclusive options, and there are a number of cases in which individuals choose to pursue both." However, elsewhere (2000a: 250), he cites evidence that the expression must be understood to mean meditation or recitation, not both, and that newly ordained monks are expected to choose one or the other. Perhaps Schopen will clarify this question with regard to the Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya in the future.

21. Schopen 1999: 286.

22. The *Kṣudrakavastu* passage lists these five benefits a few pages before (as noted by Schopen 1999: 317n40). This is the same listing as that cited below from the *Cīvaravastu* (Textual Materials 6) or the virtually identical passage in the *Śayanāsanavastu* (Gnoli 1978a: 37.27–38.3), as Schopen noted (1999: 290, with n. 41).

23. Schopen 1999: 287, quoting the Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya from S 6, *'dul ba, ta* 265a4, and D 6, *'dul ba, tha* 175b2: *ngas dge skos las dgongs te gsungs kyi | dge slong gnas brtan gnas brtan dag ni ma yin no || 'on kyang legs par gsungs pa'i chos 'dul ba la rab tu byung ba'i dge slong gi las ni gnyis te | 'di lta ste | bsam gtan dang 'don pa'o ||*. The translation is Schopen's.

> well-spoken Dharma and Discipline is twofold, to wit: meditation and recitation.

Here again, we find an apparent rejection of administration or service, although the text is, the reader will have noticed, somewhat inconsistent or even schizophrenic. Is not "the monk in charge of physical properties" at the same time also, and even more basically, a "monk who has entered the Order of this well-spoken Dharma and Discipline"? Are monks who undertake to carry out administrative tasks then not fulfilling their proper monastic role? Some texts seem to imply this, or even more. Schopen refers in this context to a Mahāyāna sūtra, the *Maitreyamahāsiṁhanāda*, as follows:[24]

> But what then, Kāśyapa, are the activities of a śramaṇa? They, Kāśyapa, are those two activities which I have taught, meditation and recitation. But even those two activities were only taught for the sake of causing [others] to enter the path. Even they are not the final and full conclusion. The activity, Kāśyapa, which enters [the path] for the sake of exhausting all activity—that is the [proper] activity of a śramaṇa.

Such an abstract and philosophically essentially *śūnyavādin* critique appears to supersede the normal uses of language, or at least to be making a point quite unrelated to the question of how real communities might be organized. Since our concern in this study is solidly with questions of the organizational structure—even if only theoretical—of real monastic communities, we need not further consider this extreme and abstract philosophical formulation here.

Having confronted an array of materials challenging the value of service or administrative involvement, we may now explore their opposite, a detailed and energetic exposition, and implicit defense, of the administrative monk. And this is of interest among other reasons because it comes not from a Vinaya or monastic code, but from a Mahāyāna scripture. The entire fourth chapter of an extremely interesting text, the *Ratnarāśi-sūtra*, concerns the administrative monk

24. Textual Materials 7. See Schopen 1999: 285, 290–291. As Schopen 1999: 315n25 notes, there is some instability in the technical term here, with some texts reading **bhikṣu*, others **śramaṇa*. The Chinese translation of the sūtra confirms this:

> What are the activities of a bhikṣu? Kāśyapa, as I have previously explained, there are two kinds of activities of a *śramaṇa*: meditation and recitation. And as I have explained, because these are for the sake of entering the path, they are not the final explanation. Kāśyapa, if there is an activity which can exhaust activity, that is called the activity of the *śramaṇa*.

Probably, in this context, no real distinction is intended between *bhikṣu* and *śramaṇa*.

(*vaiyāpṛtyakara bhikṣu*), an individual whom the text makes responsible for the well-being of the monastic community, and most especially the religious specialists, but also for the care of the stūpa.[25] This central monument of the typical Buddhist monastery, and symbol of the Buddha's continued presence in the world, is important in this context since it is treated as a legal person, with rights of ownership and fiscal independence. It is stated in the *Ratnarāśi* that the administrative monk should assure that wilderness-dwelling monks (*āraṇyaka*) are not burdened with mundane tasks, that alms-begging monks (*paiṇḍapātika*) enjoy delicious food, and that the *yogācāra* meditation monks should not have their quiet disturbed. The administrator must encourage studious monks to apply themselves to their study, and arrange for those dedicated to preaching to have audiences available and favorable conditions prepared in which to present their sermons. It is also his responsibility to take care of certain aspects of financial administration. In other words, this scripture takes cognizance of a very basic issue so often simply overlooked, not only in modern studies of Buddhism but in its classical sources as well. The infrastructure within which the Buddhist life may be practiced is not sui generis. Food does not simply appear at meal times without some intervention. Audiences do not simply appear to listen to sermons without some planning and organization. In light of the detail and importance of this chapter, intrinsically but also for what is to follow, I present here a translation of the whole:[26]

1. The Reverend Mahākāśyapa spoke to the Blessed One: "Blessed One, what sort of monk shall perform administration?" The Blessed One said: "There are two [types of] monks, Kāśyapa, I allow to perform administration. Which two? The monk who is purified, who is fearful of censure in the other world, who has confidence [in the idea that results will come about for him as] the maturation of [his own] deeds, and who feels shame and feels remorse, and also the one whose depravities are destroyed and who has become an Arhat—Kāśyapa, I allow these two unimpaired monks to perform administration.
2. Why? Because, Kāśyapa, in this well-taught Dharma and Vinaya are renunciants from various backgrounds, they possess various

25. I studied this text in Silk 1994 and am now revising the edition and translation for publication.

26. Textual Materials 8. I have excluded all notes from this translation, in view of my forthcoming complete study.

Note that this entire chapter is quoted by Atiśa in his *Mahāsūtrasamuccaya* (D 3961, *dbu ma*, *gi* 45a2–48a2; edited in Mochizuki 2004: 75–80). See Mochizuki 2002a: 105–110 (518–513) for a translation. A complete Japanese translation of the sūtra has also been published (Mitsuhara 2004, in which see 78–97).

types of mental predispositions, and they engage in various types of yogic practices for the sake of renunciation [*prahāṇa*]: some delight in the bed and seat of the pacified forest dweller, some are alms beggars, some dwell among the relations from their village, some have a purified way of living, some apply themselves to great learning, some are reciters of the Teaching, some uphold the corpus of the teaching regarding the monastic discipline [*vinaya-dhara*], some uphold the corpus of the teaching regarding scholastic categories [*mātṛkādhara*], and some enter into villages, towns, markets, districts and metropolises and preach the Teaching. Because it is difficult to protectively watch over the thoughts and actions of other beings [I allow only those two types of pure monks to be administrators]. In this respect, Kāśyapa, the adminstrative monk should please the minds of all the monks of the community.

3. Now, Kāśyapa, whichever wilderness-dwelling monks keep their seat and bed in a border region should not be charged [with tasks] by the administrative monk. The administrator must look after those forest-dwelling monks, and he shall not make requests of them at inappropriate times, he shall not send them on errands at inappropriate times. If it falls, Kāśyapa, to the turn of the wilderness-dwelling monk to carry out the student's task relating to the community's work, the administrative monk should do that task himself. Or, appointing another monk he should order him to do that task, but should not pressurize the wilderness-dwelling monk.
4. Kāśyapa, that administrative monk should allot sumptuous food to those monks who practice alms begging. Kāśyapa, the administrative monk should give to those who are *yogācāra* monks appropriate paraphernalia, medicine to cure the sick, and personal belongings. In whatever place that *yogācāra* monk is dwelling the administrative monk should not cry aloud and yell, nor permit [others] to do so. The administrative monk should protect that *yogācāra* monk, and also provide him with a bed. He should give him sumptuous food, savories and hard food and soft food suitable for [one in] the stage of the practice of yoga. It occurs to that [administrative] monk: "This [*yogācāra*] monk lives in order to promote the Tathāgata's Teaching. I should generously provide him with all the appropriate personal belongings," and he should resolve to take very good care of him.

5. Kāśyapa, the administrative monk should encourage whichever monks apply themselves zealously to great learning, saying: "You must accept the transmitted teachings, you must read them, you must recite them, and I must be your attendant. The more greatly learned you become, the more you must become an ornament of the community of monks. You must sit down and ornament [the community] with your speech. You must make your own wisdom supreme." Kāśyapa, the administrative monk shall not send them on errands at inopportune times, and he shall not assign them tasks. The administrative monk should protect those monks of great learning.
6. Kāśyapa, the administrative monk shall not assign tasks to those who are reciters of the Teaching. He shall cause them to enter villages, towns, markets, districts and royal metropolises and preach the Teaching. He shall inspire the audience. He shall purify an assembly area. He shall arrange an assembly area for the elegant preaching of the Teaching. The administrative monk shall expel those monks who do injury to a monk who is a preacher of the Teaching. The administrative monk shall always greet the monk who is a preacher of the Teaching, and shall congratulate him generously.
7. Kāśyapa, that administrative monk shall go before those monks who uphold the corpus of the teaching regarding the monastic discipline and those who uphold the corpus of the teaching regarding scholastic categories and shall ask them: "How may I be faultless and uncorrupted? How may I administer in a manner free from offence?" Then those monks who uphold the corpus of the teaching regarding the monastic discipline and those who uphold the corpus of the teaching regarding scholastic categories, understanding that administrative monk's intention, shall inform him what he must do, what will happen, and what the means are to carry it out.
8. The administrative monk shall take good care of the monks who uphold the corpus of the teaching regarding the monastic discipline and those who uphold the corpus of the teaching regarding scholastic categories, and he shall generate faith, respect and high regard [toward them]. From time to time the administrative monk shall distribute to the community of monks what is the property of the community, but he shall not

hoard the community's property and conceal it. The property is to be given as it was received; it is to be given without being urged; it is to be given without objection. He should not proceed with lust, hatred, delusion or fear.

9. He shall devote himself to the community of monks; he shall not devote himself to the group of householders. He shall devote himself to the necessities of the community; he shall not devote himself to his own necessities. He shall not produce any idea that he shall rule over even a single thing, but rather, no matter how trifling the matter, he shall act according to the counsel of the community, not according to his own inclination.
10. Whatsoever are the belongings of the local community, the universal community or the stūpa, he should assign them accordingly, and he shall not mix those of the local community with those of the universal community. Neither shall he mix the possessions of the universal community with that of the local community. He shall not mix the possessions of the local community and universal community with that of the stūpa. Neither shall he mix the possessions of the stūpa with that of the local community and universal community. If the universal community is destitute and the local community has plenty, the administrative monk shall summon the community of monks and make them agree unanimously; then he shall exchange from the local community's possessions to the universal community.
11. If a stūpa of the Tathāgata is gone to ruin and the possessions of the local community or the universal community are abundant, the administrative monk shall gather all of the community of monks and make them agree unanimously, saying: "The stūpa of the Tathāgata is gone to ruin, but the possessions of the local community and the universal community are abundant. If, Reverends, you have no objection, if you are favorably inclined, if you allow, if you approve, I will take a small amount of supplies from these possessions of the local community and the universal community and I will repair the Tathāgata's stūpa." If the community allows it, that administrative monk shall do so. In case the community does not allow it, that administrative monk shall request the donors and benefactors and obtaining [their contribution] he shall repair the Tathāgata's stūpa.

12. No matter, Kāśyapa, how vast the possessions of the stūpa, the administrative monk shall not give them to the local community or the universal community. Why? If even so little as a single thread given to the stūpa by those faithful and full of devotion is a shrine for the world together with its gods, what need is there to mention jewels and highly valued objects? Whatever clothing is given to a stūpa had best be destroyed by wind, sun, and rain; clothes given to a stūpa shall not be exchanged for gold or valuables. Why? Because what belongs to the stūpa is totally without price, and because the stūpa is itself without any want.
13. The administrative monk, Kāśyapa, should thus purify things, and he should not mix up the belongings of the Three Jewels. He should be content with his own possessions. He should not have the idea that those properties controlled by the Three Jewels are his own.
14. Any administrative monk, Kāśyapa, who possesses a mind of anger, if he gets angry toward or rules over and orders about precept keepers, virtuous ones and those worthy of veneration, will, on account of those bad acts, go to hell. Even if he is reborn in a human world he will become a slave or servant of another, and he will be beaten and kicked by violent fist blows, slaps and weapons.
15. Moreover, Kāśyapa, if the administrative monk goes beyond the duties [necessary to] the community and commands the monks according to his own inclination, ordering them, punishing them, frightening them, threatening them, giving them untimely commissions or untimely orders, on account of those bad acts he will be born in the individual hell named "many nails." And being born there his body will be pierced by one hundred thousand iron nails; they will catch fire, and blazing up [the fire] will spread burning everywhere.
16. Whoever would speak [creating] hurtful verbal karma by threatening precept keepers, virtuous ones, or those worthy of respect will be born there [in that individual hell], and his tongue will be one hundred leagues in size, and one hundred thousand iron nails will be buried in that tongue of his, and they too will catch fire, blaze up, and thoroughly blazing everywhere [the fire] will spread everywhere, burning, and become a [true] conflagration. Why? Because he threatened [the monks] and spoke [so producing] destructive verbal karma with his speech.

17. If any administrative monk, Kāśyapa, collecting the possessions of the community and hoarding what he has collected, does not give it out from time to time, [or] scorning and tormenting he gives it, and some he gives, some he does not give, to some he gives, to some he does not give, then on account of those bad acts he will be born in a hungry ghost realm called "sunk up to his knees in excrement and mud." After he is born there, other hungry ghosts will seize his food and show it to him. And then, when they show it to him, he will stare at that food with both eyes unblinking, and pained by hunger and thirst he will experience feelings of suffering. But he will not obtain that food even in one hundred thousand years. Even if at some point, at some time, he were to obtain that food, it would become vomit and pus and blood. Why? Because he did not gratify precept keepers, virtuous ones and those worthy of respect, and he was not content with what he himself possessed.
18. If any administrative monk, Kāśyapa, were to jumble together what belongs to the local community, or the universal community, or the stūpa, the [karmic] maturation of that could not be expressed in words, even if I were to reckon for aeons.
19. If any administrative monk, Kāśyapa, having heard of such miserable destinies as these were to produce anger or abuse or hatred or wrath, I declare that he is incurable. Therefore, Kāśyapa, hearing such True Teachings as these, the administrative monk should purify his body, speech and mind. He should protectively look after himself and others.
20. The administrative monk, Kāśyapa, even if he has to eat his own flesh, should not enjoy the bowls, robes, alms food, medicines or equipments controlled by the Three Jewels.

The administrative monk envisioned here is a powerful and responsible manager of the monastic community. It is his coordination and logistical supervision that permit various types of religious specialists to carry out their practices undisturbed. Moreover, he is sympathetically depicted, a praiseworthy and respected individual, upon whom his responsibility must weigh heavily. Any failure to carry out his duties well and honestly will lead to horrible karmic results.

Some of this concern is expressed through the rigorous qualifications expected of the prospective administrator. Unfortunately, the relevant section of the text is not extant in Sanskrit, and the two available translations

differ somewhat in their treatment of the items. The Tibetan translation of the *Ratnarāśi*, translated above, permits two types of "unimpaired monks" to be administrators:

1. The monk who
   a. is purified,
   b. is fearful of censure in the other world,
   c. believes in karmic retribution, and
   d. feels shame and feels remorse; and

2. the one
   a. whose depravities are destroyed, and
   b. who has become an arhat.

The Chinese translation of the *Ratnarāśi*, however, divides things rather differently:

1. one who
   a. can purely uphold the precepts, and
   b. is fearful of censure in the other world;[27] and

2. one who
   a. is aware of, and knows the results of, karmic actions,
   b. feels shame and modesty and repents,
   c. i. is an arhat, and
      ii. can practice the eight liberations.

However the details are understood, these descriptions refer to two types of monk, one still dutifully on the path, the other having already attained the final goal. Therefore, the basic qualification for administrative duty is honest engagement in the monastic vocation, whether or not that vocation has yet borne spiritual fruit. This formulation hints at the assumption that some monks, at least, would not be able to fulfill these qualifications. Some, these qualifications imply, may not have upheld the precepts to the satisfaction of their fellows, not feared the karmic results of their actions—or acted in a way which suggested that they did not—and some may not have displayed any remorse when they were perceived to have violated the norms of the community or society. This formulation, however, even if paralleled else-

27. There is an interesting technical problem with the Chinese translation here, possibly pointing to an intermediate Prakrit source. I have examined the issue in Silk 1994: 684–686. Its details, however, do not affect the present discussion.

where, hardly allows us to draw conclusions about the realities of monastic life. Are these "requirements" really any different from our own expectations, ideal if nothing else, and therefore more on the order of impossible dreams, that our politicians be upright and honest, respect the law, and wish to serve the people? If this is a valid analogy, we cannot honestly expect that the governance of the monastic community, any more than the governance of a modern nation-state or municipality, was always carried out in accord with its own high standards.

Another Mahāyāna scripture, the *Sūryagarbha-sūtra*, contains a description of the administrative monk very closely parallel to that in the *Ratnarāśi*. This text too, like the *Ratnarāśi*, is not extant in Sanskrit, and thus again we have access to it only in Tibetan and Chinese translations. The Tibetan version reads:[28]

> Then King Bimbisāra asked the Blessed One: "Reverend, when the Blessed One mentions the "administrator [**vaiyāpṛtyakara*]," how many [types of] people are designated with the designation administrator?"
>
> The Blessed One said: "Great King, I permit two [types of] monks to be administrators. Which two? The Arhat who has cultivated the eight liberations, and the monk who is [still] a learner [**śaikṣa*] and stream-winner [**srotaāpatti*]. Great King, these two [kinds of] monks I permit to carry out the actions of the administrator."

Although not as radically variant as in the case of the *Ratnarāśi*, here too one Chinese version has some differences:[29]

28. Textual Materials 9. This passage too, like the *Ratnarāśi*'s entire chapter, is quoted by Atiśa in his *Mahāsūtrasamuccaya* (D 3961, *dbu ma*, *gi* 44b6–45a1; Mochizuki 2004: 75). See Mochizuki 2002a: 105 (518) for a translation.

29. This is the text T. 397 (14), quoted in Textual Materials 9, as is another Chinese version found in T. 397 (13).

The coincidence between this passage and the corresponding one in the *Ratnarāśi* was already noticed in the seventh century by Daoxuan 道宣, who remarked on and quoted the two passages together in his *Sifenlü shanfan buque xingshi chao* 四分律刪繁補闕行事鈔 (T. 1804 [XL] 55b12–16 [*juan zhong* 1]); see Silk 1994: 591–592. Fazang 法藏 quoted the same not many years later in his commentary on the **Brahmajāla-sūtra*, *Fanwangjing pusa jieben shu* 梵網經菩薩戒本疏 (T. 1813 [XL] 616c8–17 [*juan* 2]), as did a Japanese subcommentary on Fazang's text dating to 1318, the *Bommōkaihonsho nichijushō* 梵網戒本疏日珠鈔 of Gyōnen 凝然 (T. 2247 [LXII] 100c1–29 [*juan* 18]).

> The Buddha said, "Great King, there are two types of people who are worthy to uphold the responsibilities of the community and protect the property of the community. Which are the two? First, an Arhat who has perfected the eight liberations. Second, learners who have attained the three [lower] fruits, stream-winning and so forth. These two types of people are worthy to work as administrators, and to take care of the monastic community. Other monks, those whose precepts are not perfect or whose minds are not equanimous, may not be made administrators."

The very close similarity of these expressions to those in the *Ratnarāśi* cannot obscure the fact that the strictures in the *Sūryagarbha* are much tighter than those in the *Ratnarāśi*. The latter asks, essentially, only for good will and honesty, while the former expects some degree of (formulaically defined) spiritual accomplishment of its administrators. Arhats are essentially perfected beings, while the learner and stream-winner are those less advanced on the path to perfection. How the possession of such qualifications might have been adjudicated within an actual community is, of course, quite another matter.[30]

Such discussions are naturally not limited to these two texts, nor of course to the genre of Mahāyāna scripture. It is the literature of the monastic regulations, the Vinaya, which has the most to say about administration and service. In their references to those undertaking adminstrative responsibilities, examples of which we will investigate in some detail, Vinaya texts mention and list five qualifications. They specify that a monk with these five qualities is suited to undertake any of a number of service roles. The individual in question must be one who would not act in a misguided way through desire, anger, delusion, or fear and who would know some specific fact vital to his function, this last item differing according to the administrative role in question.[31] We noticed that in the *Ratnarāśi*'s discussion, the administrative monk is expected to distribute the goods of the community without desire, anger, delusion, or fear (paragraph 8, above); other expressions in this and the following sections precisely parallel the fifth qualification as well, making it clear that the *Ratnarāśi* shares this clichéd expectation of administrative competence with the Vinaya literature.

30. Concerning putative social verification of inner experiences, see the very interesting paper by Sharf 1995.

31. We will consider this classification in detail later.

Other instances of positive evaluations of service occur in different contexts. The Mahāyāna sūtra *Sāgaramatiparipṛcchā* puts at least certain types of service in a very good light indeed:[32]

> Again, Gentle son, serving, adoring, attending upon, rising for, making obeisance to, being respectful toward, reverencing, obeying, protecting, receiving [as a guest], providing with robes, begging bowl, sleeping mat, medicaments and other equipment, applauding, protecting as a master, preserving the virtue of, exposing the merits of, concealing the demerits of those preachers of the Teaching who expound such sūtras as these and who regard correct practice as quintessential is [called] protectively embracing the True Teaching.

This is rather close to being a selective summary of the job description of the *vaiyāpṛtyakara bhikṣu* in the *Ratnarāśi*, although to be sure the context of this *Sāgaramatiparipṛcchā* passage makes no explicit reference to monks, being directed rather to any devout follower. Nevertheless, despite passages like this which seem to honor service roles, the difference of opinion over their value is very real. As we have already seen, the positive valuation of service illustrated in some texts is far from universal in Indian Buddhist literature. Whether Mahāyāna scriptures like the *Ratnarāśi*, the *Ākāśagarbha*, the *Adhyāśayasaṁcodana*, and others, the dates and places of composition of which are all equally unknown, should be understood to have been composed by authors directly or indirectly aware of each other is a difficult question. But there is no doubt that all of these texts do participate in a general conversation, the dynamics of which can only be correctly appreciated when as many voices as possible are heard. We would very much like to be able to trace influences here and to track this conversation as it unfolds, but alas, as is usual with the literature of Indian Buddhism, since it is virtually impossible for us to date or localize any of these texts, any diachronic evaluation of influences is beyond us. The only possibility left to us is to approach them synchronically, and we are thus compelled by the nature of our evidence to extract and imaginatively to reconstruct what may or may not have been a real debate or discussion from materials accessible to us only as an undifferentiated and unstratified whole. The contrast between the respective valuations of monastic service is a real one; whether this represents any genuine historical "debate" is an entirely different question.

To be sure, from one point of view, the attitudes of these texts are not in conflict with one another; as the other scriptures do, the *Ratnarāśi* also

32. Textual Materials 10.

assumes that the administrative monk attends upon and serves those engaged in various forms of practice. The text is quite clear that those engaged in serious practice—forest dwelling, alms begging, meditation, study, and teaching—are not to be assigned administrative tasks.[33] The text in no wise devalues these practices. Still, the tones of the various sources are entirely different, and while they may agree in their respect for meditators and others, the valuations they place on administration are clearly divergent in their respective emphases. We may wonder about the significance of this difference in tone. The *Ratnarāśi* seems to present a rather calm series of guidelines for the roles to be filled by the administrator. It accepts without polemic the value of this activity and concerns itself with making clear the details of this responsibility. The *Adhyāśayasaṁcodana*, on the other hand, seems in comparison almost shrill. There is no room in this text for any appreciation of the value of administration, despite the scripture's tacit acceptance of its necessity.

If we wish to understand the locus of debate on the role of administration in these texts, through which we might approach part of the much more general question of what it means to be a Buddhist monk, we must in the first place explore the meaning of the key terms in the discussion. This suggests us at the outset to investigate the use and significance of the word *vaiyāpṛtyakara*, the key term in the *Ratnarāśi*'s presentation, and thus it is to this term that we now turn.

33. Virtually the same stipulation is offered in a seminal text of the Theravāda tradition, Buddhaghosa's *Samantapāsādikā* (Takakusu and Nagai 1924–1947: 357.24–358.11; the Chinese parallel is translated in Bapat and Hirakawa 1970: 264).

This page intentionally left blank

3

Vaiyāpṛtyakara

Without a clear context, it is difficult to offer a good translation for the term *vaiyāpṛtyakara bhikṣu*, which might mean simply a monk engaged in service, or be better rendered "administrative monk," "supervisory monk," "manager monk," or the like. The form *vaiyāpṛtyakara* is derived ultimately from the verb *vy-ā* √*pṛ*, meaning to be occupied or employed. It appears in the great ninth-century Sanskrit-Tibetan lexicon the *Mahāvyutpatti*, where it is given the Tibetan equivalent *zhal ta pa*,[1] which indeed sometimes appears even in translations with the simple sense of "look after, take care

1. The entry (8736) has *zhal ta pa=vaiyavṛtyakaraḥ*, so spelled in Sakaki 1916 and Ishihama and Fukuda 1989; Sakaki reports the xylograph reading as *vaiyaprityaka*, but the Mhy. index writes *vaiyāvṛtyakara*. The long vowel *vaiyā°* is undoubtedly correct. The Tibetan spelling in Sakaki's edition, *zhal lta pa*, is not confirmed in the critical edition of Ishihama and Fukuda (1989), but is occasionally found in texts.

The problems of the phonology of the term in its Sanskrit and Pāli forms have been treated by Lüders 1954: §99 under the rubric of *p/v* alternation. See also Pischel 1981: §199; Geiger 1943: §38.5; von Hinüber 1986: §181; and Edgerton 1953 (grammar): §2.30. While it is obvious that the etymological form is that with *p*, this does not at all imply that the usage with Middle Indic *v* should be considered any less original or correct. This is especially so in the context of Buddhist materials for which, whether they are written in Sanskrit or a form of Sanskritized Prakrit, some Middle Indic background, historically or environmentally, may be presumed. Below, I print the form found in the source I am quoting (checking manuscripts when possible), noting that many of these may have been adjusted by editors.

It is now fairly clear that the Vinaya entries in the *Mahāvyutpatti* are probably derived from Guṇaprabha's commentaries, especially his *Vinayasūtra* and *vyākhyāna* on the same; see Hu-von Hinüber 1997: 196. Guṇaprabha, in his turn, seems to have been heavily dependent on the *Vinaya Uttaragrantha* of the Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya, as Schopen 2001: 103–105 has shown.

of."[2] The eighteenth-century bilingual glossaries of Tshe ring dbang rgyal and Bstan 'dzin rnam rgyal have the same Tibetan form, with the Sanskrit equivalents *vaiyāpratyakara*, *vārika*, *adhiṣṭhata* (for *adhiṣṭhātṛ*), and *vaiyāpṛta*.[3] In the texts we have been discussing, including the Tibetan renderings of the *Ratnarāśi* and its quotations in Śāntideva's *Śikṣāsamuccaya*, the equivalent of *vaiyāpṛtyakara bhikṣu* is given as *dge slong zhal ta byed pa*, as we find in the *Śikṣāsamuccaya* elsewhere for the same term. The Chinese translations of both the *Ratnarāśi* and the *Śikṣāsamuccaya* have *yíngshì bǐqiū* 營事比丘.[4] We will pay more attention to this and other Chinese renderings below.

Here, we must once more stress the necessity of grounding our studies in Indic language sources, for while the renderings *zhal ta byed pa* or *zhal ta pa* seem to be standard for *vaiyāpṛtyakara*, they can also represent other terms. In the *Vinayasūtra* of Guṇaprabha, for instance, *zhal ta byed pa* seems to render *adhiṣṭhātṛ*, a roughly synonymous term, although in Buddhist sources apparently uncommon,[5] while in several Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya passages *zhal ta* (*bya*) or *zhal ta byed pa* renders various forms of *pratijā√gṛ*, including *pratijāgraka*.[6] We will also notice below that, as the Tibetan glossaries suggest, in several compound terms *zhal ta pa* renders the Sanskrit element -*vārika*.[7]

The term *vaiyāpṛtyakara* has been discussed by Hakamaya 1993a, 1993b, 1996: 239–240, and then in response to Silk 1994: 215–254, in 1996a (see also 1996b: 250, addendum).

2. See, for instance, the very interesting passage in the Mūlasarvāstivāda *Kṣudrakavastu* (D 6, *'dul ba, tha* 234a3–235a2), where it is opposed to *yal bar dor ba*, "to ignore" (**upekṣāṁ√kṛ*).

3. Bacot 1930: 149a1–2. Several of these are listed as equivalent to *zhal ra ba*, which must be an error on the part of the Tibetan copyist; *ta* and *ra* are virtually identical in *dbu med* script. The form *adhiṣṭhata* is listed under *zhal ra* (with *ajñā*), again to be taken as *zhal ta*. See also Bstan 'dzin rnam rgyal 1976: 259a2.

4. As I have shown (Silk 1994: 649), the *Śikṣāsamuccaya* has, in its quotations of the *Ratnarāśi*, quoted the preexisting translation of that text found in the Kanjur. The Song dynasty Chinese translation of the *Śikṣāsamuccaya* is on the whole a good witness to the poor quality of such late translations. Inexplicably, the translators seem not to have made good use of preexisting Chinese translations, although occasionally we see evidence that they consulted them.

5. There are a number of examples of Tibetan variations of *zhal ta byed pa* rendering *adhiṣṭhātṛ*: At D 4117, *'dul ba, wu*, 5b2–3, . . . *zhal ta ma byas par* . . . *zhal ta byed pa* . . . have the Sanskrit equivalents (1.174–175 in Sankrityayana 1981; 1.177–178 in Bapat and Gokhale 1982) . . . *anādhiṣṭhitā* . . . *adhiṣṭhātrī*. At *'dul ba, wu*, 14a3, *zhal ta byed pa* is found in Sanskrit (Sankrityayana 1981: 15.27, 2.96) as *adhiṣṭhātur*. (It appears that the sūtra at 40a6, *rang gis zhal ta byas na'o*, has no equivalent in the published Sanskrit text; it should be on Sankrityayana 1981: 50.)

6. *Bhaiṣajyavastu*: D 1, *'dul ba, ga* 23b2ff.; S 1, *'dul ba, ka* 17b7ff.=Wille 1990: 111 (225v8ff.); *Poṣadhavastu*: Hu-von Hinüber 1994: 282, §16.1ff., and n. 6 (D 1, *'dul ba, ka* 135a1; S 1, *'dul ba, ka* 200b3): *dge slong spong ba'i zhal ta byed pa*=*prahāṇapratijāgraka bhikṣu* (and see the *Ekottarakarmaśataka* in D 4118, *'dul ba, wu* 195b2). In the *Vinayasūtra* at D 4117, *'dul ba, wu* 79a3, *zhal ta bya'o* renders Sanskrit (Sankrityayana 1981: 96.11) *pratijāgṛyāt*.

7. I do not know what, if any, relevance the modern Tibetan uses of the term *zhal ta pa* as an administrative designation in (pre-1959) monasteries may have. See Nornang 1990. According to this study (p. 253), "The monk selected to be the *zhal-ta-pa* supervised the kitchen and its staff. . . . Only the *dbu-mdzad* [ritual/music chief] and the *zhal-ta-pa* were permitted the keys and seals to strongboxes containing monastic documents." This study also discusses the role of the *dge bskos*, a term we will encounter as a translation of Sanskrit *upadhi-vārika*. This *zhal ta pa* may be a specifically Gelukpa usage; the vocabulary in the Sakya monasteries

The same word is found in Pāli as *veyyāvaccakara*, and again in the canonical language of the Jainas, Ardhamāgadhī. We also encounter *vaiyāpṛtyakara* in classical Sanskrit, for instance in the *Arthaśāstra*, and in lexicographical and Dharmaśāstric works, but there is no indication in these sources that any specific office or even exact role is meant.[8] In several places, the sense seems to be something like "agent," in the sense of a business or sales agent, a representative who carries out business on behalf of another.[9] We will see that this accords very well with the sense of *veyyāvaccakara* in Pāli Vinaya literature.

Among the earliest modern interpretations of the term in Buddhist Sanskrit sources are those found in the nineteenth-century works of Eugene Burnouf and Émile Senart. Burnouf translated it as "le serviteur de la Loi,"[10] while Senart, in discussing the word *vaiyāvṛtya* in the *Mahāvastu*, referred to the Pāli form *veyyāvacca*, remarking that it is used to mark the respect rendered by an inferior to a superior.[11] Childers's dictionary, to which Senart referred, defines *veyyāvaccaṁ* as "service or duties performed by an inferior for a superior," but gives for *veyyāvaccakaro* simply "one who does business or executes a commission for another, an agent," a sense very similar to that which the Sanskrit *vaiyāpṛtyakara* seems to have in non-Buddhist literature. Childers's reference for this meaning is the Pāṭimokkha (Sanskrit Prātimokṣa), the core set of rules

---

studied by Cassinelli and Ekvall 1969 appears to differ. (Dagyab 1980 deals with civil administration directed by a monastic center, and thus is not directly relevant to the questions we are investigating here.)

8. For the *Arthaśāstra*, Kangle (1963: 2.5.18, 2.8.22, 4.8.9) lists in reference to treasury officers: *upayukta-nidhāyaka-nibandhaka-pratigrāhaka-dāyaka-dāpaka-mantri-vaiyāvṛtyakara*, translating "subordinate officer, store-keeper, recorder, receiver, person who pays, person who causes the payment to be made, the adviser and the helpmate." It is suggested by 2.5.18, however, that no particular officer is meant, but rather something closer to the generic "assistant." The meaning "sales agent" in 3.4.25–30 seems to be different, although obviously related (perhaps just an applied meaning?).

The word is cited by Monier-Williams 1899: 1024c in the form *vaiyāvṛttyakara*, as well as *vaiyāpṛtyakara* and *vaiyāvṛttikara=bhogin*, citing only the lemma L(exicographers). His source for this is, no doubt, as usual, Böhtlingk and Roth 1855–1875: VI.1407a, where the latter is cited from Hemacandra's *Anekārthasaṁgraha* 2,278. The form *vaiyāpṛtyakara*, again as equivalent to *bhogin*, is cited in Böhtlingk 1879–1889: VI.169a from Śāśvata's *Anekārthasamuccaya*; the same is found in *Maṅkhakośa* 454c: *vaiyāpṛtyakaro bhogī*. The commentary (Zachariae 1897: 60) has [*bhogin*] *vaiyāpṛtyakaro vyāvahārikaḥ | vyāvahārikabhujaṁgayoḥ*. Here again, the meaning seems far from that in our texts.

According to Deo 1956: 226, 371, the Jaina *Oghaniryukti* commentary v.125 explains *vṛṣabha* as *vaiyāvṛtyakaraṇasamarthaḥ*.

9. In addition to the *Arthaśāstra* passages mentioned above, the *Nāradasmṛti* (Vyavahārapadāni, Ṛṇādānam 10; Lariviere 1989: i.58, ii.31) uses the word, according to the commentary of Asahāya, in the sense of a business agent: *vaiyāvṛttyakaraḥ vyāvṛttasaysa bhāvo vaiyāvṛttyam | tat kartuṁ śīlam asyeti vaiyāvṛttyakaraḥ | vyāpārakārīty arthaḥ*.

10. Burnouf 1844: 274, translating what is now edited in Cowell and Neil 1886: 54.19. The passage in which this occurs is discussed below. It may be noted that Burnouf probably added "de la Loi" on the basis of the expression *dharmavaiyāvṛtyaṁ karoti* just a few lines earlier.

11. Senart 1882–1897: i.594, note to Mv. i.298.19 (misprinting *veyyavaccaṁ*). He has apparently based his claim directly on Childers 1875/1909: 565a.

designed to govern the monks' life, and here we find one relatively early instance of the word.

The term *veyyāvaccakara/vaiyāpṛtyakara* appears in the rule Niḥsargika Pātyantika (Pāli Nissagiya Pācittiya) 10 in the extant Prātimokṣas belonging to the various sects of Buddhism, having there the sense of someone capable of receiving and holding in trust robes and, by extension, other gifts on behalf of a monk.[12] Since monks are normally forbidden to accept donations of many sorts directly, it is necessary for them to assign or appoint an agent who will accept donations from benefactors on a monk's behalf. It is specified in the Prātimokṣa texts of virtually all of the sects (for which we have extant literature) that this role may be filled by either an *ārāmika* or an *upāsaka*.[13] The various versions and the different forms into which the relevant terms are translated are as follows:

Sarvāstivāda: *vaiyyāpatyakara*[14] = *zhīshí shǒuyuánrén* 知識守園人 (?)[15] and *zhíshìrén* 執事人, *ārāmika* = *sēngyuánmín* 僧薗民 and *shǒusēngfāngrén* 守僧坊人, and *upāsaka* = *yōupósāi* 優婆塞.[16]

Mūlasarvāstivāda: *vaiyyāpṛtyakara* = *zhal ta byed pa*[17] = *zhíshìrén* 執事人, *ārāmika* = *sēngjìngrén* 僧淨人, and *upāsaka* = *wūbōsuǒjiā* 鄔波索迦.[18]

12. For a detailed treatment of this rule, see Hirakawa 1993b: 198–223.

13. As Hirakawa 1993b: 209 notes, the Sanskrit text of the Mahāsāṁghika Prātimokṣa omits *upāsaka*, although its Chinese translation has it. He considers this an error of the Sanskrit text; Nolot 1991: 164n11 seems to agree tacitly, inserting *upāsakā vā* in brackets. They are probably correct that the word has simply fallen out due to copyist error.

Matsuda 1981b discusses the issue of the logical relation between *veyyāvaccakara* and *ārāmika* and *upāsaka*, concluding that the latter are two types of the *veyyāvaccakara*. (See too Hakamaya 1993a: 303 [35], n. 49 [= 2002: 244n7], who points out that many who translated the relevant passage into Japanese have misconstrued it.) However, Matsuda also notes a translation of a Sarvāstivāda Prātimokṣa, known only from a Dunhuang version, which treats the three as parallel categories. In Niḥsargika 10 in the text edited by Inokuchi 1981: 194, ll. 124–126, we find 寺主及擾拔塞薗田民, which might allow us to group them as 1 + 2, but the following 某是寺主某是擾拔塞某是薗田民 suggests indeed that all three are understood to be parallel. For an earlier summary of references to this manuscript, see Yuyama 1979: 2 (1.11.C.2). See also Matsuda 1981b: 124; 1982b: 315.

14. Sanskrit in von Simson 2000: 188; earlier, Finot and Huber 1913: 494.9. For the transcription of individual manuscripts, see von Simson 1986 (this spelling on 44, 65–66, 122, 174, 220, and 271–272; on 135–136, *vaiyāpatyakara*).

15. T. 1464 (XXIV) 876b7.

16. T. 1435 (XXIII) 47a15–16 (*juan* 6). See Rosen 1959: 88–90; T. 1436 (XXIII) 473a21–23.

17. Raghu Vira and Lokesh Chandra 1959: 25, folio 16a4. Printed edition in Banerjee 1977: 27.17 (with wrong reading); Tibetan in Vidyabhusana 1915: 96.13; Huth 1891: 8.16. The *Bhikṣuṇī Prātimokṣa* version is at D 4, *'dul ba, ta* 11b2. The latter is translated in Rockhill 1884: 20.

This rule is referred to in the *Vinayasūtra* as follows (Sankrityayana 1981: 31.2–3 [3.10.714]): *preṣitam akalpikaṁ cīvaramūlyaṁ pratikṣipya paripraṣṇapūrvakam upadiṣṭaṁ vaiyāpṛtyakaraṇam ādiṣṭaṁ dūtenokto vṛttāntatvākhyāpūrvakaś codayet*. In Tibetan (D 4117, *'dul ba, wu* 25a4–5) it runs: *bkur ba rung ba ma yin pa chos gos kyi rin spangs nas yongs su dri ba sngon du btang zhing bstan te | bsgo zhing smras pa byung ba'i mtha' rjes su brjod pa sngar byas pa'i zhal ta byed pa la bskul bar gyur na'o ||*.

18. T. 1454 (XXIV) 503a3–4. See also T. 1442 (XXIII) 734c19–20 (*juan* 20) = D 3, *'dul ba, cha* 124b2–3.

Theravāda: *veyyāvaccakara*.[19]

Mahāsāṃghika: *vaiyāpṛtyakara*[20]=*zhíshìrén* 執事人, *ārāmika*=*yuánmín* 薗民, and *upāsaka*=*yōupósāi* 優婆塞.[21]

Mahīśāsaka: *zhíshìrén* 執事人.[22]

The *Bhikṣuṇī Prātimokṣa* version is at T. 1455 (XXIV) 511a12–13: *zhíshìrén* 執事人, with *sēngqiéjìngrén* 僧伽淨人 and *wūbōsīqié* 鄔波斯伽.

Note the interesting version in the *Vinayavibhaṅga*, commenting on Niḥsargika 18. In Tibetan, the text employs standard vocabulary (D 3, *'dul ba*, *cha*, 149a3–5; S 3, *'dul ba*, cha 100b3–5): a monk must ask a *zhal ta byed pa* (**vaiyāpṛtyakara*), who is a *kun dga'* (S *dga'i*) *ra ba pa* (**ārāmika*) or a *dge bsnyen* (**upāsaka*). The former is defined as *rung ba byed pa* (**kalpikāraka*), the latter as *gsum la skyabs su song ba bslab pa'i gzhi lnga bzung ba* (one who takes the three refuges, **triśaraṇa*, and upholds the five precepts, **pañcaśikṣāpada*). In Yijing's Chinese, we find the following equivalents (T. 1442 [XXIII] 741b16–19 [*juan* 21]): *zhíshízhīrén* 執事之人 is either *sìjiārén* 寺家人 or *wūbōsuǒjiā* 鄔波索迦. The *sìjiārén* is defined as *jìngrén* 淨人, purifier, **kalpikāraka*; the *upāsaka* as one who *shòusān guīwǔjiè* 受三歸五戒, takes the three refuges and upholds the five precepts. The same passage is found in the *Bhikṣuṇīvibhaṅga* in Chinese: T. 1443 (XXIII) 958c19–21 (*juan* 10). (As noted by Sakurabe 1930–1932: 412n, the Tibetan and Chinese versions of these texts do not quite agree. The observation that the *Bhikṣuṇīvibhaṅga* translated into Tibetan does not belong to the Mūlasarvāstivāda was already made by Bu ston [Vogel 1985: 110].)

In these passages, *sìjiārén* 寺家人 is an interesting equivalent for *ārāmika*; *sìjiā* renders *ārāma*. See Mochizuki 1932–1936: 1762c–1763a, who notes a passage in the Mūlasarvāstivāda *Vinayasaṁgraha*, T. 1458 (XXIV) 558b12–13 (*juan* 6), in which we find the word *sìjiā jìngrén* 寺家淨人 (the Tibetan at D 4105, *'dul ba*, *nu* 155a6, has the standard *kun dga' ra ba pa*); we find the same in T. 1442 (XXIII) 761a2–3 (*juan* 25), almost equivalent to the Bhikṣuṇī version in T. 1443 (XXIII) 963b17 (*juan* 10). (On the *Vinayasaṁgraha*, see Sasaki 1976 and 1977. Indianists are not likely to find much of interest in Shaku Keihō 1939 or 1940.)

The *Vinayasūtra* and its auto-commentary refer to this passage at D 3, *'dul ba*, *cha*, 149a1–b1, as follows (Sankrityayana 1981: 32.26–27 [2.3.18]): *dānapate svāmitvādhimokṣo vaiyyāpṛtyakarasya svāmitvādhimokṣau vaiyyāvṛtyākarasya | svāmitvābhyupagamanam adhiṣṭhānam iti kalpāḥ*. The Tibetan translation is found in D 4117, *'dul ba*, *wu* 26a5–6, with the auto-commentary in D 4119, *'dul ba*, *zhu* 161a5–b4.

19. Vadekar 1939: 8.1; Oldenberg 1879–1883: iii.220.4. See now Pruitt and Norman 2001: 32–34, and for the Bhikkhunī rule (*Nissaggiyapācittiyā* 20), 154–156. In the *Bhikkhunīpātimokkha*, the gender of *veyyāvaccakara* is masculine. This is not noted by Pruitt and Norman 2001: xlii–xliii in their remarks on "gender differences in rules," but the variant readings they quote from Wijayaratna's version of the text show that he at least thought the form should be feminine. Even if, as seems most likely, the traditional reading is indeed in the masculine, I think it questionable whether this permits us to assume that nuns had male—as Norman translates *veyyāvaccakara*—"stewards." (Hüsken 1999 discusses the general issue of the adaptation of monks' rules for nuns, but without much relevance to the current case.)

20. Sanskrit in Pachow and Mishra 1956: 16.17; better than this is the text in Tatia 1975: 14.29. One should now also refer to the transcriptions of the manuscript in Roth 1970: 167, and again in Nolot 1991: 164n11. (It is hard to know which of the latter to trust most, but probably Nolot's edition may be considered reliable.) Nolot 164–166 also offers a translation, in which she renders *vaiyāpṛtyakara* simply by "agent." (Similarly without precision, *ārāmika* is rendered "serviteur.") Note that the Bhikṣuṇī Vinaya itself refers for the rule in question to the Bhikṣu Prātimokṣa, and thus lacks any reference to the crucial term.

21. T. 1426 (XXII) 551b11–12; T. 1425 (XXII) 305c28 (*juan* 9).

22. T. 1421 (XXII) 28c15 (*juan* 4); T. 1422 (XXII) 196b15.

Dharmaguptaka:[23] *zhíshìrén* 執事人, *ārāmika* = (*shǒu*) *sēngqiélánmín* (守)僧伽藍民, and *upāsaka* = *yōupósāi* 優婆塞.[24]

Kāśyapīya: *zhíshìrén* 執事人, *ārāmika* = *shǒuyuánrén* 守園人, and *upāsaka* = *yōupósāi* 優婆塞.[25]

It is obvious from the stories introduced in these texts to justify or rationalize the promulgation of this Vinaya rule, stories which we need not recount here,[26] that the *vaiyāpṛtyakara* is conceived of in this context as a non-monk. Of the individuals who are permitted by this rule to be *vaiyāpṛtyakara*, the category of *upāsaka* seems to be relatively general; minimally, one qualifies by undertaking a small set of vows. The question of what and who *ārāmikas* were is, on the other hand, a very difficult one, but it is relatively safe to say that they were in some sense employees of the monastery or under compulsion to work in or for it.[27] Neither *upāsakas* nor *ārāmikas* are or can be monks (although they might in theory become monks, thereby voiding their previous status), and thus in no way can the *vaiyāpṛtyakara* in this Vinaya rule be a monk either. In fact, the very logic of the rule forbids it. The *vaiyāpṛtyakara* is to do precisely what a monk is not permitted to do. Therefore, the *vaiyāpṛtyakara* himself obviously cannot be a monk. This fact alone already alerts us that some conception of the *vaiyāpṛtyakara* fundamentally different than that in the *Ratnarāśi-sūtra* is in use here, since that text refers explicitly to the *vaiyāpṛtyakara bhikṣu*.

With reference to the rule Nissaggiya 10 in the Pāṭimokkha, Buddhaghosa in his Vinaya commentary *Samantapāsādikā*, a work composed in Ceylon, defines *veyyāvaccakara* as *kiccakara kappiyakāraka*, a "legalizer" who does necessary tasks.[28] The term *kappiyakāraka* is an important technical term desig-

23. In a fragment of the *Bhikṣuvinayavibhaṅga* of the Dharmaguptakas, at the end of *Saṁghāvaśeṣa* 5, we find the form [*v*]*aiyyā*[*patyā*]*ni* (Chung and Wille 1997: 73). However, this appears to be derived from *vyāpad*, in the sense of hurt or injury, as suggested by the Chinese version at T. 1428 (XXII) 584a5 (*juan* 3).

24. T. 1430 (XXII) 1025b11–12, trans. Beal and Gogerly 1862: 434–435; T. 1428 (XXII) 613a21 (*juan* 7). This illustrative story is translated in Weiger 1910: 391–393; T. 1429 (XXII) 1017b25–26, trans. Weiger 1910: 233.

25. T. 1460 (XXIV) 661c3–4.

26. As one example, see Horner 1938–1966: ii.62–70. For a study of this account, see Yamagiwa 2002b.

27. See Schopen 1994b; Yamagiwa 1999, 2002a; and cf. Matsuda 1981a, 1981b. We may note that the Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya, at least, frequently refers to the suitability of assigning tasks to *ārāmikas* and *upāsakas*, but in such formulaic contexts it apparently does not use the term *vaiyāpṛtyakara*. (See the passages cited in Schopen 1994a, as examples.)

28. Takakusu and Nagai 1924–1947: iii.672.22–23. See Matsuda 1982c, as well as 1981b, 1982a. As Matsuda 1982a: 141–142 points out, the term *kappiyakāraka* appears in the canonical Pāli Vinaya only in the commentary sections (and rarely there), never in rules or illustrative stories, suggesting that it is not as old as terms such as *ārāmika* or *veyyāvaccakara*.

nating one who renders things acceptable or legal on behalf of a monk, which is what such a servant does by accepting donations on the monk's behalf. Here, then, it reinforces the interpretation of *veyyāvaccakara* as agent. On the other hand, in another place, the *Samantapāsādikā* defines *veyyāvaccakara* as "one who, taking his wages, cuts trees in the forest or does some other work. If he becomes ill, so long as his relatives do not notice he should be given medicine [by the monks]."[29] This usage appears to be entirely different, and as far as I know is not paralleled in Indian sources.[30] It does, however, have something

It is certainly both true and important, although frequently overlooked, that Buddhaghosa, though himself an Indian, regularly presents in his commentaries materials which reflect particularly Ceylonese conditions. To use his writings as evidence for Buddhism in ancient mainland India as such is therefore problematic. Nevertheless, his understandings, like those of Chinese or Tibetan translators, provide invaluable interpretations of Indian materials, and thus cannot be disregarded even in a study of purely Indian developments. The Chinese translation of Buddhaghosa's text appears to render *veyyāvaccakara* with *shǒusēngfáng* 守僧房, one who protects the monastery/monastic cells (T. 1462 [XXIV] 775b28–29 [*juan* 15]: 若守僧房者。爲僧驅使人也, trans. Bapat and Hirakawa 1970: 428). Later in the same discussion, it is said that there are two types of *kappiyakāraka*, and in the subsequent detailing the term *veyyāvaccakara* occurs repeatedly. Here, it is the term *kappiyakāraka* which is translated *zhíshìrén* 執事人, but the following instances of *veyyāvaccakara* are also rendered with the same Chinese equivalent (iii.675, 775c17ff.; thus, n. 19 on p. 775 of the Taishō edition seems to be in error. See Bapat and Hirakawa 1970: 429). Later again, near the end of the same section concerning the tenth Nissaggiya, occurs a list of individuals who might be offered to the community as gifts. In Pāli, the list is *dāsa*, *ārāmika*, *veyyāvaccakara*, and *kappiyakāraka*. In Chinese, these terms are reduced to three: *nú* 奴, *jìngrén* 淨人, and *zhíshìrén* 執事人 (iii.683.6–7, 776c7; see Bapat and Hirakawa 1970: 432). The equivalence of *nú* 奴 with *dāsa* is certain, and that of *jìngrén* 淨人 with *ārāmika* here extremely likely. It may be that the Chinese version has conflated *veyyāvaccakara* and *kappiyakāraka*, since as we have just seen it sometimes translates them identically with *zhíshìrén* 執事人. (Matsuda 1983b made a start at an inquiry into the later history of the term *jìngrén* 淨人, attempting to sketch its development from a menial layperson in Indian materials to a monastic post in Chan and Zen traditions.)

29. Takakusu and Nagai 1924–1947: ii.470.3–5: *veyyāvaccakaro nāma yo vetanaṁ gahetvā araññe dārūni vā chindati aññaṁ vā kiñci kammaṁ kavoti tassa rogaṁ uppanne yāva ñātakā na passanti tāva bhessajjaṁ kātabbaṁ*. Here, perhaps as evidence of some confusion, it seems to be *veyyāvaccakara* which is rendered in the Chinese translation with *jìngrén* 淨人 (T. 1462 [XXIV] 753b1–3 [*juan* 9]): 淨人者。雇其得入林斫伐樵薪。若得病未至家、比丘與藥。An additional sentence has no Pāli parallel: "If he stays at home, the monks may not provide him medicine" 若已至家、比丘不得與藥 (trans. Bapat and Hirakawa 1970: 329). The nearly complete lack of standardization in the Chinese treatment of these terms is plain and, as we shall see, appears to be a typical feature of the way such terminology was used generally, perhaps even in Indic-language sources themselves.

30. We may also take note of another passage, the interpretation of which is not entirely easy. Commenting on the first *Pārājika* (Oldenberg 1879–1883: iii.27.7), in a discussion of ways in which one may give up the monastic life (disavow the training), Buddhaghosa says in his *Samantapāsādikā* (Textual Materials 11):

> "Call me an *ārāmika*." There is no disavowal by saying this with varied expressions. The disavowal of the training comes by saying with varied expressions about the *ārāmika*: "Call me a *kappiyakāraka*, a *veyyāvaccakara*, a grass remover, distributor of rice gruel, distributor of fruit, distributor of dry foods."

This passage seems to imply that all of the terms listed are considered equivalent to *ārāmika*, one who is not ordained. Part of the confusion here is that the last three posts, distributors of rice gruel, fruit, and dry foods, are explicitly mentioned in the *Cullavagga* VI.21.2 (Oldenberg 1879–1883: ii.176.26–27, 32) as posts to be filled by monks (and not just any monks, but those who meet certain qualifications). These administrative roles are discussed in more detail below.

in common with Indian descriptions of the activities ascribed to those who hold another administrative title, that of *navakarmika*, as we will discover below.

This understanding of *vaiyāpṛtyakara* as a sort of personal assistant is not rare in the Vinaya literature and occasionally appears elsewhere as well. A passage in the *Varṣāvastu* of the Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya has a monk stating before the rain retreat begins that he will pass the rains with so-and-so as *vaiyāpṛtyakara* and in such-and-such a place.[31] While there is no further specification here of the meaning of the term, it is almost certain that the reference is to the *vaiyāpṛtyakara* who acts as agent for the monks. This is made more likely by the version of the same passage found elsewhere in the same Vinaya, in the *Vinayasaṁgraha*.[32] A complication to this picture comes from a story in the *Karmaśataka*, a Mūlasarvāstivāda story collection we will study below, in which the **vaiyāpṛtyakara* selected to look after the community during the rain retreat is indeed clearly a monk.[33]

In a passage from the *Saṁgharakṣitāvadāna* in the *Pravrajyāvastu* of the Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya, it is stated in reference to the Buddha Kāśyapa that, aeons ago, he lived in Benares, and the beings there were his *śrāvakas*, *bhikṣus*, *śrāmaṇerakas*, and *vaiyyāpṛtyakaras*. It is not clear what this listing indicates, or

---

Von Hinüber (1996: 108–109, §220) has discussed the authorship of the *Samantapāsādikā*, suggesting that "perhaps three different specialists were at work, when S[amanta]p[āsādikā] as a whole was created," going on to say that "there is no evidence that the chief redactor was Buddhaghosa." It is quite possible that some of the apparent inconsistency we see here might be linked precisely to this multiple authorship. For convenience, however, I continue to refer to the *Samantapāsādikā* as the work of Buddhaghosa.

31. The passage is in Dutt 1939–1959: iii.4.136.5–11, and again in Härtel 1956: 125. Both print *vaiyāvṛttakareṇa* here, but this is clearly wrong. The facsimile of the manuscript (Raghu Vira and Lokesh Chandra 1974: folio 733=75v6), read with the assistance of Klaus Wille, has *vaiyyāpṛtyakaraṇa*. The Tibetan translation at D 1, *'dul ba, ka* 240a6–b4 has *zhal ta bgyid pa*. The Chinese seems to vary somewhat from the Sanskrit text, but the equivalent for *vaiyāpṛtyakara* is clear: *yíngshìrén* 營事人. See T. 1445 (XXIII) 1042a16–17, 29.

This passage, along with a preceeding one at Dutt 1939–1959: iii.4.135.14ff., is the basis of *Vinayasūtra* 3.9.65 (Sankrityayana 1981: 79.17–18, §3.6.65): *amukena dānapatinām amukena vaiyyāvṛttyakareṇāmukena gocarāgramakena śvaḥ saṁgho varṣā upagamiṣyāmīty ārocayet*; Tibetan at D 4117, *'dul ba, wu* 62b5–6. See also the closely following passage (Sankrityayana 1981: 79.23–24, §3.6.70): *sattve dānapativaiyāvṛttyagocaragrāmikopasthāyakānām utkīrttanam* (Tibetan 63a1–2). Compare also the passage quoted below on p. 143, n. 29, from the *Vinayasaṁgraha* (D 4105, *'dul ba, nu* 170a7–b1), where it is specified that this announcement is made by the/a **vihāra-pāla*. See also the next note.

32. Pointed out by Durt 1979: 435a. The *Vinayasaṁgraha*, T. 1458 (XXIV) 564c1 (*juan* 7), calls this **vaiyāpṛtyakara*, *yíngshìrén* 營事人, an "authorized person," *xǔrén* 許人, but there is no equivalent in the Tibetan version at D 4105, *'dul ba, nu* 170b1–4, which does differ substantially from the Chinese text.

33. See Textual Materials 12, and below p. 180. As we will see, this text's monastic *vaiyāpṛtyakara* is functionally equivalent to the *vaiyāpṛtyakara* in Niḥsargika 10, a fact which seems to be made possible by a complete disregard for the Prātimokṣa's restriction against monastic money handling.

how to understand *vaiyyāpṛtyakara* here, although as we will see in just a moment, shortly after this passage in the same text the monk Saṁgharakṣita is designated *vaiyāpṛtyakara*.[34]

The sense of the term *vaiyāpṛtyakara* in a verse found in Sanskrit in the so-called *Mahākarmavibhaṅga*, apparently a text of the Sammitīya sect,[35] paralleled in the Pāli *Aṅguttara-Nikāya*, is also far from clear. The *Mahākarmavibhaṅga* passage recounts that a poor man conceived the thought of faith upon seeing the Blessed One, along with his retinue of auditors, eating. This earned him a great amount of merit, eventually leading to his liberation. Knowing this, the Blessed One said, in verse:[36] "Those who rejoice in that, and those who are *vaiyāvṛtyakara*, have no lack of remuneration; rather, both [groups of people] have a portion of merit." It is not very clear what *vaiyāvṛtyakara* means here, and evidently the Tibetan translators did not understand the term in any technical sense.[37] Moreover the verse is also found in a completely different context in the *Aṅguttara-Nikāya*, where the reference is to the giving of gifts.[38] Filliozat renders:[39] "Those who rejoice in this and who fulfil their responsibility, nothing is found wanting in their earning and they have their share of *puṇya* [merit]." It may be, therefore, that at least as used by the author(s) of the *Mahākarmavibhaṅga*, the word *vaiyāvṛtyakara* refers merely to some sort of service offered to the monks or the monastic community, without any necessary implication that this is recognized by some formal status.

Although the genre of literature is quite different, the idea of *vaiyāpṛtyakara* as agent appears to underlie the use of the term in at least one passage in a Mahāyāna treatise as well. In a discussion of the circumstances under which a bodhisattva may carry out actions which otherwise would be considered sinful, the *Bodhisattvabhūmi*, a portion of the massive *Yogācārabhūmi* compendium, states:[40]

34. Vogel and Wille 1996: 263.33–34. The Tibetan version (Eimer 1983: 296.1–2) has only *de dag de'i nyan thos su gyur to* (and see Vogel and Wille 1996: 291n149). Chinese (T. 1444 [XXIII] 1037b1 [*juan* 4]) lacks any equivalent. The *Divyāvadāna* (Cowell and Neil 1886: 342) lacks the entire reference.

35. For the sectarian identification, see the sources cited by Kudo 2004: ix.

36. Lévi 1932: 57.8–12; Tibetan at 196.18–25; French translation 128. The Sanskrit reads: *ye tatrābhyanumodante vaiyāvṛtyakarāś ca ye | anūnā dakṣiṇā teṣāṁ te 'pi puṇyasya bhāginaḥ ||*. See now the critical edition of Kudo 2004: 112–113, and note the reading of manuscript A: *ye tatra anumodaṁte vaiyāvṛttañ ca kuravata iti*. See also Kudo's n. 28 on p. 256.

37. The Tibetan for pāda b is *de'i las ni nyams su su len pa*.

38. Morris and Hardy 1885–1900: iii.41.22–23. In what is apparently a Chinese parallel to this in the *Ekottarikāgama* (T. 125 [II] 681bc), it is hard to nail down what should correspond to this verse.

39. Filliozat 1980: 244 in his discussion of *puṇya*.

40. Textual Materials 13. Translated in Hakamaya 1993a: 315 (23) = 2002: 240–241, and (from Tibetan?) in Tatz 1986: 71.

As Hakamaya 1993a: 299 (39), n. 83 = 2002: 248–249n41, points out, the Tibetan word offered here

> The bodhisattva, carefully considering the cases of those *vaiyāpṛtyakaras* or *ārāmikas* who through bad management waste the goods belonging to the community or belonging to the stūpa, and who consume them as [if they were] their own personal goods, thinks: "I do wish they wouldn't do this, which will lead to negative results for them and to their loss and disadvantage for a very long time." And he removes them from their positions of authority.

While there is no indication here whether the *vaiyāpṛtyakara* is a monk or layman, it is clear that he is someone in some position from which he exercises control over the economic goods of the monastic community and the stūpa; but it is not clear, for instance, what difference—if any—there is between his responsibilities and those of the *ārāmika*. Xuanzang's Chinese translation of the *Bodhisattvabhūmi* here renders *vaiyāpṛtyakara* with *zhòngzhǔ* 衆主, which may be understood to express one "in charge of the community."[41] In light of the Prātimokṣas' Niḥsargika 10, it is interesting to see *vaiyāpṛtyakara* and *ārāmika* arrayed here side by side, although their parallelism, rather than *ārāmika* being one kind of *vaiyāpṛtyakara*, and the absence of any reference to *upāsakas*, makes the correlation with the Prātimokṣas' presentation less than perfect.

Not all uses of the term, of course, even in closely related literature, convey the same technical sense. Several examples of the word *veyyāvaccakara* are found in the stories of the Pāli *Jātaka*, which is not Indian strictly speaking, being again, at least in its final form, like Buddhaghosa's works a Ceylonese composition. In this collection, *veyyāvaccakara* in one place seems to have the sense of a king's official,[42] a kind of agent but not one associated with the monastic community, while in another example a park servant (*uyyānapāla*) is

---

as an apparent equivalent of *ārāmika*, *skyed mos tshal bsrung ba*, is given the equivalent *udyānapāla* at *Mahāvyuttpati* 3842 (and see the *Jātaka* passage referred to directly below). On the other hand, when we turn to the dictionary of Tshe ring dbang rgyal (Bacot 1930: 11a2), we find alongside *skyed mos tshal=upabanaṁ* (read: *upavanam*, and see *Mahāvyutpatti* 2994); *adyanaṁ* (read: *udyānam*); *urthanna* (read: *utthanna*?); *uryena* (?); *urthānaḥ* (read: *utthāna*), also the entry *skyed mo tshal=ārāma*.

41. As noted below, n. 53 (in a passage from the Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya), *vaiyāpṛtyakara* is again translated *zhòngzhǔ* 衆主. We may note that in the Mahāsāṃghika *Bhikṣuṇī-Vinaya*, the Chinese translation (due to Faxian 法顯, not Xuanzang) likewise characterizes Mahāprajāpatī as *zhòngzhǔ* 衆主 (T. 1425 [XXII] 540c10 [*juan* 39]). The term which appears in the parallel Indic text in this case is *vṛṣabhī samānā*, defined by the text itself as *prabhū samānā* (Roth 1970: §239 [275–276], trans. Nolot 1991: 300–301, in which the expression is rendered " 'Alors qu'elle dirige la communauté' signifie 'alors qu'elle possède l'authorité' "). The Chinese text (T. 1425 [XXII] 540c23 [*juan* 39]: 衆主者、衆之標望得自從意; see Hirakawa 1982: 347) understands this as: " 'Head of the Order' means: one to whom the others look up, who can influence others." (We recall too the Jaina definition cited above in n. 8 *vṛṣabha=vaiyāvṛtyakaraṇasamarthaḥ*.)

42. Jātaka 398 (Fausbøll 1877–1896: iii.327.14). Cowell et al. 1895–1907: iii.202 translate "officers," while Matsumoto Shōkei in Nakamura 1982–1991: 5.51 renders *meshitsukai* 召使い ("servant").

drafted by a king as *veyyāvaccakara* in service to a *paccekabuddha*.[43] He keeps his own home, engages in hunting, and has a wife and children.[44] This, if anything, seems to be close to the example cited above from the likewise Ceylonese *Samantapāsādikā*, in which we saw *veyyāvaccakara* defined as woodcutter, although the aspect of acting in service to a religious practitioner in the *Jātaka* example is notable.

We cannot help but notice a fundamental tension here with respect to what is, at least homophonically and homographically, the same term. Limiting our attention to apparently specialized Buddhist uses of the term, in the *Ratnarāśi* the *vaiyāpṛtyakara* is a responsible monk, while in the Vinaya usage we have examined so far, the same term—or at least what looks like the same term—refers to a non-monk who is delegated certain administrative responsibilities, but clearly does not have any authority over monks. In light of this, and obviously assuming not only a linguistic but also a historical identity, Noriaki Hakamaya suggested the rather linear explanation that the *vaiyāpṛtyakara* of the *Ratnarāśi* is a descendant of the individual mentioned in the Prātimokṣa as a nonmonastic servant. He proposed that the *upāsakas* and *ārāmikas* of Niḥsargika 10 were permanent residents of the monastery, but that the *vaiyāpṛtyakara* was originally selected from among them temporarily. Later, according to him, in the stage of development represented by the *Ratnarāśi*, this managerial role became a permanent office.[45] A further examination of the terms *vaiyāpṛtya* and *vaiyāpṛtyakara* may help us to evaluate Hakamaya's hypothesis.

The paradigmatic named monastic administrator, or service monk, at least in the Vinaya literature, is Dravya Mallaputra (in Pāli, Dabba Mallaputta). We will examine further references to him later, but for the present it will suffice to note that it is clearly stated already with reference to the rule Saṅghādisesa 8 in the Pāli Vinaya that this Dabba Mallaputta undertakes *veyyāvacca*.[46] Here, "service to the monastic community" (*saṁghassa veyyāvacca*) is immediately clarified by the phrase "assignment of seats and beds and distribution of

43. See n. 40.

44. Jātaka 420 (Fausbøll 1877–1896: iii.439.19). The crucial sentence is *sumaṅgalaṁ uyyānapālaṁ veyyāvaccakaraṁ katvā*. This Sumaṅgala then faithfully serves the *paccekabuddha* (*sakkaccaṁ upaṭṭhahi*). Virtually the same pattern is found in Jātaka 431 (Fausbøll 1877–1896: iii.497.25), however with *uyyānapālaṁ paricārikaṁ katvā*, which suggests that *veyyāvaccakara* and *paricārika* are to be treated as equivalent in this context.

45. Hakamaya 1993a: 303 (35), n. 49=2002: 244n7.

46. Oldenberg 1879–1883: iii.158.12–15. Also *Cullavagga* IV.4.4 (Oldenberg 1879–1883: ii.74.34–75.1). See Hirakawa 1993a: 468–479.

food to the monastic community,"[47] the two paradigmatic activities of distribution and thus of monastic administration most generally speaking. Although we cannot be absolutely certain of the vocabulary, since we have no extant Sanskrit version, the same seems to be stated in the Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya, which refers to Dravya Mallaputra's service in Tibetan as *zhal ta byed pa'i las*, and in Chinese with the expression *wéizhòng jiǎnjiào láokǔ wúluàn* 爲衆撿校勞苦無亂, "exhausting oneself in temporary service for the community, without [mental] wavering."[48] (We will examine the important term *jiǎnjiào* 撿校 below, where I will argue for its implication of "temporary service.") This passage certainly suggests, if it does not prove conclusively, that it is not possible to easily maintain the hypothesis of a simple chronological development, from an early stage in which *veyyāvacca* was something carried out by lay assistants to a later stage in which monks themselves had taken over these chores, since while the former status is supported by Nissaggiya 10 in the Pāli Pāṭimokkha (and in parallels in the Prātimokṣas of other sects), the latter appears in the very same text's Saṁghādisesa 8 (and *mutatis mutandis* for other sects). It is another issue, although certainly also crucial, whether the Vinaya literature as we have it and the earlier Mahāyāna sūtra literature really have their origins in significantly different chronological strata. I believe they probably do not. But with reference specifically to Hakamaya's hypothesis of a chronological or even logical development, it will be a sufficient counterexample to show that the Vinaya literature itself contains, side by side with the servant *veyyāvaccakara*, another monastic conception as well. It is thus not necessary to resolve the question of whether there exists any chronological gap between the Vinaya literature and Mahāyāna sūtras, such as the *Ratnarāśi*, at all, as Hakamaya has apparently assumed. Moreover, in addition to the reference to Dravya Mallaputra, Vinaya literature itself and related texts contain a fair number of stories which do presume, or even directly state, that a monk is a *vaiyāpṛtyakara*.

The concluding vignette of the *Saṁgharakṣitāvadāna*, a tale found in the *Pravrajyāvastu* of the Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya and on that basis in the *Divyāvadāna*, contains the story of a former birth of the monk Saṁgharakṣita in the time of the past Buddha Kāśyapa.[49] He was a *vaiyāpṛtyakara* and had five

47. *Saṁghassa senāsanañ ca paññāpeyyaṁ bhattāni ca uddiseyyan ti.*

48. D 3, *'dul ba, cha* 274b2–275a4; T. 1442 (XXIII) 774b27–c18 (*juan* 27). This is part of the commentary to Pātayantika 9 (81 in the Pāli Vinaya), which states that, after agreeing to the presentation of a robe by a formal motion in the assembly, one may not later complain that the presentation was prejudicial. See Hirakawa 1995: 213–226.

49. Vogel and Wille 1996: 265–266, 294–295. (The text had been edited earlier in Näther's 1975 doctoral thesis, pp. 39–40, but remained almost unavailable until the publication of Vogel and Wille's revised edition and translation.) The account is presented in Cowell and Neil's 1886 edition of the *Divyāvadāna* as

hundred disciples.[50] It is stated that, although he maintained pure conduct (*brahmacarya*; celibacy) his life long, he did not manage to acquire the merit necessary for spiritual progress.[51] When the *vaiyāpṛtyakara* of the story of the past is identified with Saṁgharakṣita, it is stated in the *Divyāvadāna* and in the Tibetan translation of the Vinaya that the karmic result of the *dharma-vaiyāpṛtyaṁ* (religious service?) which he carried out is his present rebirth in a wealthy family.[52] The Chinese translation of the Vinaya text specifies that it is the *vaiyāpṛtyakara*'s offerings to the monastic community (*gōngyǎng sēngqié* 供養僧伽) which accounts for his present situation, the term used having an implication of material support.[53] The extant Sanskrit text of the Vinaya version, based, as is usually the case, upon a single manuscript, refers only to *vaiyāpṛtya*, service, but it is possible, or even likely, that this is due to an error in the textual transmission, from which the common word *dharma*° dropped out.

Similar is an episode found in the *Avadānaśataka*, which as we have it also belongs to the sect of the Mūlasarvāstivādins[54] and in many cases clearly reworks Vinaya narratives. There, one monk of a group of five offers service (*vaiyāvṛtyaṁ kṛtam*) to the other four.[55] Through their efforts, the four gain

---

chapter 25 (347.2ff.), but is in fact a continuation of chapter 23, as recognized already by Burnouf 1844: 332n2, and Dutt 1939–1959: iii.4.46n1. The text is borrowed by the *Divyāvadāna* from the Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya, but when Dutt edited the latter he did not have access to the Sanskrit manuscript, now presented in Vogel and Wille 1996. The Tibetan translation of the *Pravrajyāvastu* is edited in Eimer 1983: II.299, and the *Divyāvadāna* version translated in Burnouf 1844: 333. The Chinese version in T. 749 (XVII) does not seem to offer a parallel, but T. 1444 (XXIII) 1037c2–20 (*juan* 4) furnishes a close rendering.

50. Vogel and Wille 1996: 265.30–31: *tasyāyaṁ śāsane pravrajitaḥ āsīd vaiyyāpṛtyakaraḥ | paṁca cāsya sārdhaṁvihāriṇāṁ śatāny āsaṁ*. The Tibetan translation in Eimer 1983: 299.23–24 has *de'i bstan pa la 'di rab tu byung nas zhal ta byed par gyur cing | de la lhan cig gnas pa lnga brgya yod par gyur to* ||. T. 1444 (XXIII) 1037c3–4 (*juan* 4) has 僧護亦於彼出家、身作衆主。有五百弟子. Not entirely helpfully, the *Vinayavastuṭīkā* of *Kalyāṇamitra (D 4113, *'dul ba, tsu* 302a7) defines for this passage: *zhal lta byed pa zhes bya ba ni las byed pa'o*: "*Vaiyāpṛtyakara* means one who performs action(s) (**karmakāraka*?)."

51. The term *guṇagaṇa* is not altogether clear, but it seems to me that Edgerton 1953 s.v. is wrong to define it as "reckoning, counting, calculation of virtues." Tibetan has *yon tan gyi tshogs*. Chinese T. 1444 (XXIII) 1037c5–6 has the whole phrase as 乃至盡形堅持梵行無有缺犯、然無所獲. The same stock phrase is found in the *Avadānaśataka* (Speyer 1906–1909: II.51.5). See Nobel 1955: 111n7.

52. Vogel and Wille 1996: 266.21–22: *yad anena tatra vaiyyāpṛtyaṁ kṛtaṁ tasya karmaṇo vipākenāḍhye mahādhane mahābhoge kule pratyājāto*. Cowell and Neil 1886: 347.27–28 is virtually the same, save that it reads *dharmavaiyāvṛtyaṁ*. Eimer 1983: II.301.16: *'dis der chos dang ldan pas zhal ta byas pa gang yin pa'i las de'i rnam par smin pas phyug cing nor mang ba longs spyod che ba'i khyim du skyes so*.

53. T. 1444 (XXIII) 1037c18–20 (*juan* 4): 因昔衆主供養僧伽。由彼業故、得於大富長者家生. For the translation of *vaiyāpṛtyakara* with *zhòngzhǔ* 衆主, see above n. 41.

54. See Hartmann 1985; Hahn 1992; and Demoto 1998: 15. Further, according to Demoto 1991 and in detail 1998, in general, the Chinese *Avadānaśataka* is later than and dependent on the *Sūtra of the Wise and the Fool*, a fact which has, according to her, serious implications for the dating of the *Avadānaśataka*, the compilation of which she places in the fifth century. See her studies for detailed investigations of this Chinese translation.

55. Textual Materials 14. Translation in Feer 1891: 331.

arhatship, and the remaining monk thinks: "It is thanks to me that they have attained arhatship. Through my roots of good, my resolution [*cittotpāda*], and my sacrifice as a dharma-gift may those who have entered the order [*pravrajita*] have food without deficiency." The story is a bit clearer in the Chinese translation, in which it is stated that the monk encourages the donors, takes care of the community, and makes sure there is no want. In return, he urges the monks to practice diligently, and within three months they all attain arhatship. The Chinese version, at least, clearly understands that we are concerned here with some monastic administrative duties. In another episode in the same *Avadānaśataka*, the nun Supriyā, a daughter of the wealthy patron Anāthapiṇḍada, is asked by the Buddha during a time of famine to provide for all of the necessities of the fourfold monastic community for three months.[56] When she recounts this charge to her father, she says: "The Blessed One said: 'Take charge of the task of offering service [*vaiyāvṛtyakarmāṇi niyuka*] for three months.'" Here, her responsibilities consist in supplying robes, alms, food, bedding, and medicines, support which, while basic to the survival of the community, is not normally construed to be a monastic role, but is rather the essential role of the lay supporter. It is possible, of course, that we should understand this as a case of the modifications made to the established routine sanctioned for times of crisis (*āpaddharma*), during which many usual restrictions may be suspended and accommodations permitted. In any case, this *vaiyāvṛtyakarma*, while carried out by a nun, nevertheless seems to be of another type, probably closer to the type of service apparently envisioned in the passage we noticed above from the *Mahākarmavibhaṅga*.

The story of Supriyā continues with an explanation of the circumstances in the past which led to her present birth in wealth and luxury. She was a young slave girl who was granted her freedom by her master for reminding him of his charitable duties toward the Buddhist mendicants.[57] She enters the Buddhist order and carries out *vaiyāpṛtya* duties under the preaching of the Buddha Kāśyapa for a thousand years, gives multifarious offerings, and makes a vow to be born in the time of Śākyamuni through the merit she has gained.[58] Because of making offerings to the Buddha Kāśyapa, she is reborn in a wealthy

56. Speyer 1906–1909: II.9.3 (story 72: Supriyā): *bhagavān āha traimāsyaṁ vaiyāvṛtyakarmāṇi niyukteti*. In the Tibetan translation (D 343, *mdo sde, aṁ* 192b6; S 252, *mdo sde, sha* 282b7), the phrase is rendered *zla ba gsum gyi bar du zhal ta ba'i las byed par bskos so*. The Chinese translation (T. 200 [IV] 139a [*juan* 8]) abbreviates the entire discussion. See Feer 1891: 266.

57. The story is found in Speyer 1906–1909: II.13.2–15 (story 72: Supriyā), with a French translation in Feer 1891: 268–269. The entire story is found also in the *Kalpadrumāvadāna*, so far available only in Feer's paraphrase, 1891: 269–271.

58. Textual Materials 15.

house and endowed with great physical beauty. It is not clear here whether the expression *vaiyāpṛtyaṁ kṛtaṁ* should refer to the following recital of the many items of offering made to the Buddha Kāśyapa, and if not, to what it actually might refer. But it is important to notice here that the protagonist is certainly a nun—she is, the text specifies, *pravrajitā*, and the Chinese translation has **bhikṣuṇī*. If carrying out *vaiyāpṛtya* makes one a *vaiyāpṛtyakara*, which seems likely although the text here does not use the term, then this seems to suggest the existence of female monastic **vaiyāpṛtyakarā*. (Likewise, we noticed above the probability that the *vaiyāpṛtyakara* envisioned in the nuns' Prātimokṣas at the place corresponding to Niḥsargika 10 were almost certainly also women.)

The *Pūrṇāvadāna* is part of the *Divyāvadāna*, having again been extracted, as were most other parts of that collection, from the Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya. In this text, we find an episode set, like so many of the others we will investigate, in the time of the past Buddha Kāśyapa:[59]

> [Pūrṇa] was a renunciant in his order, a master of the three-fold basket of the teachings, and carried out religious service [*dharma-vaiyāvṛtya*] to the monastic community.[60] After a time, it fell to a certain arhat to be *upadhivāra*. He began to sweep the monastery. But the dirt was carried about hither and yon by the wind. He considered, "I should stay put until the wind dies down." The *vaiyāvṛtyakara* saw that the monastery was unswept, and extremely angrily he spoke severe words saying, "What son of a slave-girl is this *upadhivāra*?"

The end result of the *vaiyāvṛtyakara*'s anger is his own repeated rebirth as the son of a slave girl. However, thanks to his service to the community

59. Textual Materials 16.

60. Burnouf 1844: 273, with n. 2=1876: 244, translated as if he were already reading with Shackelton Bailey's emendation (see Textual Materials 16): "possédait les trois recueils sacrés, et remplissait auprès de l'Assemblée les devoirs de serviteur de la Loi." His note on the same page reads, "Le texte se sert de l'expression *dharma vâiyâvrĭtyam karôti*, que je n'ai encore vue que dans ce style; le tibétain la rend par *jal-ta-pa vyed-do*. Il faut probablement entendre par là celui qui sert l'Assemblée des Religieux comme domestique du monastère." See now also Tatelman 2000: 81: "He mastered the Threefold Collection of Scripture (*tripiṭaka*) and carried out the business of the Order in accordance with Dharma." Thus Tatelman interprets *saṁghasya ca dharmavaiyāvṛtyaṁ karoti*. To be sure, the Tibetan version has *chos bzhin gyis dge 'dun gyi zhal ta ba byed do*, which suggests this rendering, but the Sanskrit itself seems to me to favor the interpretation I have given it. That is, I understand the resolution of the compound as **dharmasya vaiyāvṛtya*, not **dharmeṇa vaiyāvṛtya*, as the Tibetan seems to suggest.

Note that this stock phrase also occurs in the *Karmaśataka*, which we will examine below. It is generally found there as *chos bzhin du dge 'dun gyi zhal ta byas so/zhal ta byed pa*, but sometimes *chos bzhin du* is omitted, and once (D 340, *mdo sde, ha* 46b1; S 274, *mdo sde, ha* 68a4, in story 12) we find *dge 'dun gyi zhal ta chos bzhin du bya'o*.

(*saṁghasyopasthāna*), he is born into great wealth, and thus has the opportunity to study, become a monk, and attain arhatship, a typical example of the mixed karmic results of such stories, in which both bad and subsequently good actions lead to corresponding future results.[61] Here, it seems that the terms *vaiyāvṛtya* and *upasthāna* are treated as essentially interchangeable, the latter being a fairly common word for service of many types. The term *dharmavaiyāvṛtya* is expressed in Yijing's Chinese translation of the Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya by *wèi zhūbìchú fāncì jiǎnjiào shìyè* 爲諸苾芻番次撿校事業. This translation makes use of vocabulary which seems to have a particular technical implication of actions undertaken for the monks as a temporary, alternating assignment.

The term *jiǎnjiào* 撿校 (also written 檢校 and 撿挍), which we already encountered in reference to Dravya Mallaputra's administrative role, is a technical term in the Chinese bureaucratic vocabulary from the Northern-Southern (220–589) through the Tang (618–907) dynasties, in which it indicates an official acting in an irregular and temporary capacity.[62] As such, it has, of course, a strictly secular and bureaucratic significance. It would certainly have been well known as such to the Tang translator Yijing. There is, moreover, no necessary relation between this Chinese terminology and some specific Sanskrit expression. In fact, *jiǎnjiào* often seems to be added as a sort of gloss, specifying the temporary nature of the appointment or role in question.[63] As such, it

61. Cowell and Neil 1886: 55.6–8. The corresponding Tibetan translation (D 1, *'dul ba, kha* 7b7; S 1, *'dul ba, ka* 446a5) has the key expression as *dge 'dun la bsnyen bkur byas pa*.

62. See Hucker 1985: 146 (§804): "a title used when an official holding one regular post was assigned on an irregular, temporary basis to carry out the functions of . . . another post." This sense continues through the Tang. On the word as a title in later Chinese and Japanese monastic administration, see Mochizuki 1932–1936: 1.931ac, s.v. *kengyō*.

Confusingly, this is entirely unrelated to the term *jiǎnjiào* 撿挍 found in Saṁghāvaśeṣa rules 8 and 9 in some Prātimokṣas, where it has the sense of intense questioning, and renders *samanugrāhiyamāna* (the first definition of the compound in non-Buddhist contexts in Morohashi 1955–1960: 6.582, 15684.13, is *shirabe kuraberu*, "investigate," a sense it also has in a Chinese bureaucratic context, indicating a variety of official duties concerning inspection and verification). See the examples in the Prātimokṣas of the Mahāsāṃghikas (Tatia 1975: 9.22, 28; T. 1426 [XXII] 550a26, b1) and Sarvāstivādins (von Simson 2000: 170.1, 171.1; T. 1436 [XXIII] 471b28, c4). Note that the Mūlasarvāstivāda version of Yijing has *wèn* 問 (T. 1454 [XXIV] 501c3, 5), representing, if the edition is right, *samanuyujyamāna* (Banerjee 1977: 18.1, 7). Therefore, in the language of Yijing, there should be no confusion of the terms. This terminology is not noticed by Hirakawa in his discussion of these rules, 1993a: 468–492.

63. We see a good example in a passage in the Mūlasarvāstivāda *Vinayavibhaṅga*, which in Yijing's translation has the following (T. 1442 [XXIII] 663a19–20 [*juan* 7]): 白言。聖者、我有財物無撿校人。答言。我爲撿校修營福業. The Tibetan equivalent, however (D 3, *'dul ba, ca* 146a5–6; S 3, *'dul ba, cha* 210a3–4), reads: *'phags pa bdag la kār ṣā* [S *kar sha*] *pa ṇa dag ni mchis mod kyi* [S ||] *'on kyang bsod nams kyi grogs bgyid pa ma mchis so* || *khyim bdag kho bo khyod* [S *khyed*] *kyi bsod nams kyi grogs yin no* ||. The term *bsod nams kyi grogs* translates *puṇyasahāya(ka)*, which must be rendered by *fúyè* 福業 (usually *puṇyakriyāvastu*?), but in fact the whole phrase *jiǎnjiàoxiūyíngfúyè* 撿校修營福業 conveys the intent of the single Indic term. (It appears to be

may indicate an interpretation of the scope of responsibility of the particular titles to which it is attached. We will discuss below the considerable importance that may be attached to the indication that such appointments were temporary, since this bears directly on the general question of the conception of monastic service and whether it might or might not be considered a "vocation" as such within the broader monastic vocation.

To return to the *Pūrṇāvadāna* passage, we may additionally take note of the word *upadhivāra*, here rendered perhaps somewhat interpretively with *zhīsǎsǎoshì* 知洒掃事 and *sǎodì* 掃地, one in charge of sweeping and sweeper, respectively. This term, along with its close relative *upadhi-vārika*, which we have already seen in the passage on sweeping brought to our attention by Schopen, will also be discussed below in some detail. Finally, although the translation seems to have reordered things a bit, *saṁghasyopasthāna* appears to be rendered in the Chinese translation with *qìnzhīsēngshì* 勤知僧事,[64] "working on saṁgha business." The pattern we have seen in these episodes of a past-life story and the karmic fruits of a misbehaving *vaiyāpṛtyakara* monk is a common one in a certain type of literature, and we will encounter it again, for instance, in the *Saṁghabhedavastu*'s reference to a past life of Dhanapālaka, in which he is stated to have been a renunciant and *vaiyāpṛtyakara*.[65] However, this Dhanapālaka did not respect the lesser and minor rules of training,[66] and as a result was reborn among the beasts. Yet, as a result of his service to the monastic community (*saṅghasya upasthāna*), he had plenty to eat and drink. We will have an opportunity to examine more examples of this type later, but first it is necessary to seek additional clues to the nature of the *vaiyāpṛtyakara*'s duties.

We can garner more information concerning some of the *vaiyāpṛtyakara*'s responsibilities from a reference which appears a bit earlier in the same narrative series as the *Saṁgharakṣitāvadāna* in its original Vinaya context. In the same *Pravrajyāvastu* of the Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya which is the original home of the *Saṁgharakṣitāvadāna*, we find a series of stories acting as a sort of introduction to this *avadāna* and used to justify the non-ordination of Nāgas, the *Nāgakumārāvadāna*.[67] There, we read the following reference to the

this passage which is mentioned by Schopen 2000a: 240, but since the whole book lacks references, it is hard to tell. See now Schopen 2006: 231n9.)

64. The Chinese equivalents are found in Yijing's translation of the Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya's *Bhaiṣajyavastu*, T. 1448 (XXIV) 16c24–17a21 (*juan* 4).

65. Textual Materials 17.

66. The reference seems to be to those rules referred to in Pātyantikā 10 (Banerjee 1977: 33.2; von Simson 2000: 206.5; Pruitt and Norman 2001: 72.23 [Suddhapācittiyā §72]).

67. See Vogel and Wille 1996: 248. Not extant in Sanskrit.

vaiyāpṛtyakara, who is in fact a Nāga in disguise: "There [in a monastery] there dwells an administrative monk [**vaiyāpṛtyakara bhikṣu*]; he provides all the requisites to visiting and to departing monks [**āgantukā gamikāś ca bhikṣavaḥ*]."[68] This may imply a limitation of the responsibilities of this monk to select members of the monastic community. If so understood, this picture then would diverge significantly from that painted of such an individual's chores in the *Ratnarāśi*. But it may also simply be the case that, in this instance, it is only certain responsibilities which are brought to the fore, without any necessary implication of the denial of other parallel duties.

In the *Vinaya Uttaragrantha* of the Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya, an important composite text or collection of texts still largely unexplored in modern scholarship, a **vaiyāpṛtyakara bhikṣu* is portrayed as borrowing money on behalf of the community. That this office may have authorized one to engage in such activity, however, is brought into question by the continuation of the story, in which the Buddha is made to say that it is the **navakarmika bhikṣu*, whom we will study below, who should take care of such borrowing.[69] An additional possible hint to the range of use of the word *vaiyāpṛtyakara* comes from the *Mahāvadāna-sūtra*, in which we find the assistants of each of the seven Buddhas of the past and present identified by name. In the Sanskrit Sarvāstivāda and Pāli Theravāda texts, they are called *upasthāyaka/upaṭṭhāka*, a common word for "assistant" in this literature. However, in an additional verse found only in the Sanskrit text, they are also characterized as *vaiyyāpatyakara*,[70] which is, as we recall from our review of Niḥsargika 10 in the various Prātimokṣas, the typical Sarvāstivādin spelling, just as we would expect from a text like the Turfan *Mahāvadāna-sūtra*. In the corresponding prose of the Chinese *Daben-jing* 大本經, a Dharmaguptaka text, we find *upasthāyaka* translated by *zhíshì dìzǐ* 執事弟子, and as we saw above, this *zhíshì* 執事 regularly renders *vaiyāpṛtyakara* in the context of the Prātimokṣas of all sects (the

68. The Tibetan text and an English translation (which requires some modification) are found in Ware 1938: 58, reprised on 59. A critical edition of the Tibetan is found in Eimer 1983: II.252.21–23 (reprised on 253.3). The portion of the Tibetan that I have translated reads: *dge slong zhal ta byed pa gnas te | des dge slong glo bur du 'ongs pa dang | 'gro bar chas pa rnams la yo byad thams cad kyis stobs par byed do ||*.

69. The story is cited in Schopen 2001: 115–116, quoting S 8, *'dul ba, na* 283b6–284a5; D 7, *'dul ba, pa* 196a7–b4; P 1037, *'dul ba, phe* 189b5–190a1.

Schopen translates *zhal ta byed pa'i dge slong* here as "a monk who was the service manager," which would be a very good rendering—did it not evoke in contemporary American English (for me, at least) the image of the person responsible for scheduling repair work on automobiles at a car dealership (another example of the range of meaning of "manager"). See Chapter Four for an extended discussion of *navakarmika*.

70. Fukita 2003: 44.25–26; earlier edited in Waldschmidt 1956: 78, 3d.9–10, with the missing pada b in Waldschmidt, Clawiter, and Sander-Holzmann 1968, No. 685, folio 134R1: *bhikṣava ete mahātmānaḥ śarīrāntimadhāriṇaḥ | vaiyyāpatyakarā āsaṁ[ś] cittanimitteṣu kovidā[ḥ] ||*.

second element, *dìzǐ*, means "disciple").[71] The verses in the *Daben-jing* do not precisely correspond to the Sanskrit, but they do contain the term *shì*(*zhě*) 侍(者), meaning "assistant."[72] Again, before Ānanda became the Buddha's assistant, this duty was carried out by a monk named Upavāṇa. The Chinese translation of the *Mahāparinirvāṇasūtra* by Faxian describes this situation using both Chinese terms, *shìzhě* 侍者 and *zhíshì* 執事.[73] The points to be noticed here are that, once again, the individuals referred to with these terms are monks, and second, that their duties in this context are those of personal service. It may be that in the special case of the Buddha, service to the monastic community and service to the Buddha blended into one another, but given our uncertainty about our meager evidence, no firm conclusions are possible.[74]

In ancient India, as in much of the world still today, it was assumed that household chores were the work of women. This fact makes all the more interesting a rule in the monastic codes for nuns, the Bhikṣuṇī Vinayas, which prohibits nuns from engaging in household duties, *gṛhi-vaiyāpṛtya*.[75] The Pāli Vinaya's so-called Old Commentary explains:[76] "*Household work* means: if she cooks conjey or rice or solid food for a layman, if she washes a cloak or a turban, there is an offense of expiation." The text goes on to say that it is not an offense if it is a drink of conjey (gruel), if the rice is for the monastic community,

71. It is of course not necessarily true that this or other terms which appear to represent *vaiyāpṛtyakara* in Chinese actually do so. For instance, in an interesting passage in the *Bodhisattvapiṭaka-sūtra*, in a discussion of the benefits of charity, it is stated that a gift of slaves (**dāsa-dāsī*) and laborers will bring freedom to the giver. One Chinese version (T. 316 [XI] 823b5–6 [*juan* 18]) uses for "laborers" a term which we might be tempted to identify with *vaiyāpṛtyakara*, *yíngzuòrén* 營作人. The equivalent passage in Xuanzang's translation, however (T. 310 [12] [XI] 240a26 [*juan* 41]), has the expression *núbìpúshǐ* 奴婢僕使, which would not suggest such an equivalence. The Tibetan translation further clarifies the technical terms, particularly *las byed pa'i mi* = **karmakara* (P 760 [12], *dkon brtsegs*, *wi* 65b2–3; S 11 [12], *dkon brtsegs*, *ga* 145b7; D 56, *dkon brtsegs*, *ga* 58a6).

72. T. 1 (1) (I) 3a15–26. In other parallel versions, we see only the former: in T. 2 (I) 151b23 the term *shì-zhě* 侍者 is used throughout, as in T. 125 (48.1) (II) 791a13 (*juan* 45). T. 4 (I) 159c26 likewise uses *shì* 侍.

73. T. 7 (I) 199a25–26 (*juan zhong*): 爾時有一比丘名優波摩那。如來昔日未取阿難爲侍者時。其恒執事看視如來. The same appears not to be found in other versions of the text. Note that the name Upavāṇa is represented here by *Upamāna (優波摩那 = EMC ʔuw-pa-ma-na'); on *m*/*v* alternation, see Pischel 1981: §§251, 261; and von Hinüber 1986: §§208, 209, 210.

74. On the relation of the Buddha and the monastic community, and the question of whether, after all, the Buddha himself is a monk and a member of his own community, see Silk 2002.

75. Found in the Pāli Vinaya as Pācittiya 44 (Oldenberg 1879–1883: iv.300; *gihiveyyāvacca*); in the Mahāsāṁghika Lokottaravādin Bhikṣuṇī Vinaya as No. 84, Roth 1970: §198 (7B.5ff., pp. 222–223; it is not clear to me from Roth's n. 10 whether only one or all instances of the term are spelled *vaiyāvṛtya* in the manuscript); T. 1425 (XXII) 531b18 (*juan* 38) *súrénzuò* 俗人作, trans. Hirakawa 1982: 273–274; Dharmaguptaka No. 113, T. 1428 (XXII) 752c20–753a17 (*juan* 27) *báiyīzuò* 白衣作, but in the story *yínglǐjiāshì* 營理家事 and *yínglǐjiāyè* 營理家業; Mahīśāsaka No. 148, T. 1421 (XXII) 95b1 (*juan* 14) 白衣作; Sarvāstivāda No. 142, T. 1435 (XXIII) 338a1 (*juan* 46) *yínglǐsúrénwù* 營理俗人家務, with the same in the Mūlasarvāstivāda No. 153, T. 1443 (XXIII) 1013a24 (*juan* 19). See Hirakawa 1998: 517–518.

76. Horner 1938–1966: iii.329, translating Oldenberg 1879–1883: iv.300.33–301.2: *gihīveyyāvaccaṁ nāma agārikassa yāguṁ vā bhattaṁ vā khādanīyaṁ vā pacati sāṭakaṁ veṭhanaṁ vā dhovati āpatti pācittiyassa.*

if it is for worship at a shrine, or "if she cooks conjey or rice or solid food, or washes a cloak or a turban for her own *veyyāvaccakara*."[77] Buddhaghosa's commentary says:[78] "'For her own *veyyāvaccakara*' means that supposing [her] parents arrive, [it is then permissible] to cook something [for them], having made [them] do something [such as] use a fan or broomstick, as if establishing them in the position of being [her] *veyyāvaccakara*." If I have understood this syntactically difficult passage correctly, it seems to be establishing a legal fiction whereby a nun might provide domestic service to certain specific householders, such as her parents, something which is ordinarily strictly prohibited. By "pretending" that they are, temporarily, her lay servants, she is permitted to offer them the hospitality a daughter owes her mother and father.[79]

In another Vinaya collection, that of the Sarvāstivādins, the illustrative narrative for the same nuns' Vinaya rule states that the nuns in question went to other people's houses and the householders' wives asked them to sweep, lay out the bedding, light the fire, cook the food, and serve it.[80] The Dharmaguptaka Vinaya version explains the key term as follows:[81] "Domestic chores: grinding [grain], cooking rice, roasting barley, cooking meals, laying out the bedding and seating, sweeping, drawing water, giving orders to the servants." These, as we will see, seem to be very similar to some of the responsibilities expected of administrative monks, albeit with a crucial difference. Monks are expected to provide their service to other monks (and nuns to nuns), not to householders. The Mahāsāṁghika Vinaya, as do some other versions, makes clear in its story attached to this rule that the genuine "service" (*upakāra*) that

77. Oldenberg 1879–1883: iv.301.3–5: *anāpatti yāgupāne saṅghabhatte cetiyapūjāya attano veyyāvaccakarassa yāguṁ vā bhattaṁ vā khādanīyaṁ vā pacati sāṭakaṁ vā veṭhanaṁ vā dhovati*. Horner 1938–1966: iii.329 understands "if in doing household work for herself."

78. Takakusu and Nagai 1924–1947: 935: *attano veyyāvaccakarassā ti sadepi mātāpitaro āgacchanti yaṁkiñci bījaniṁ vā sammuñjanidaṇḍakaṁ vā kārāpetvā veyyāvaccakaraṭṭhāne ṭhapetvā va yaṁkiñci pacituṁ vaṭṭati*. I thank Nobuyuki Yamagiwa and Shizuka Sasaki for their help in interpreting the text here.

79. The question of filiality, filial obligations, and monastic renuciation in India is one yet to be fully explored. The situation in China, on the other hand, continues to be discussed in detail. See, for example, Teiser 1988, and Cole 1998.

Generally speaking, the most common attitude one sees at least in the older Indian literature is that monastic children may repay their filial debts spiritually. There is less recognition of the types of obligations seen here, for example, of simple hospitality. For that reason alone, the present passage is of considerable interest.

80. T. 1435 (XXIII) 337c16–18 (*juan* 46): 爾時、助調達比丘尼、常入出他家。到他家中、居士婦言。善女、汝掃灑•敷床榻•然火•煮食•下食. The nuns in question are called those who help Devadatta, *zhù tiáodá bǐqiūní* 助調達比丘尼. I wonder whether this is the same as the Dharmaguptaka's "group of six nuns," *liùqún bǐqiūní* 六群比丘尼.

81. T. 1428 (XXII) 752c21–23 (*juan* 27): 營理家事。舂磨•或炊飯•或炒麦•或煮食•或敷床臥具•或掃地•或取水•或受人使令. As printed, the last clause with *shòu* 受 does not make much sense ("accepting servants' orders"?). It is, however, possible, as Shayne Clarke suggests, to understand *shòu* 受 as *shòu* 授, an emendation I adopt.

the householders expect of the nuns is that they expound the teaching, study, and meditate (*uddiśatha svādhyāyatha yoniśo manisikarotha*), not engage in ordinary household chores, "housework." This is extremely important for us, since it invokes precisely the tension we explored at the outset of this investigation, namely, that between service on the one hand and study and meditation on the other. Although it may not use precisely the terminology we have seen Schopen characterize as typically Mūlasarvāstivādin, the Mahāsāṁghika Vinaya stance fully agrees with that of the Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya in that it expects not only of men but even of women that, having renounced the world and become ascetics in the Buddhist order, they will abandon domestic chores and undertake one of the two proper activities of the Buddhist monastic, meditation or study and recitation. It is true that here the specification that the objectionable duties are those due to householders does allow us to distinguish this criticism from any criticism of monastic caretaking or administration as such, and thus the parallel with those passages we noticed at the outset of this study is not perfect. However, it is clear that once again we are concerned, in a typologically similar fashion, with the very same tensions.

This type of idea is, once again, found in Mahāyāna works as well. In a sūtra called *Mañjuśrīvikurvāṇa*, item eighteen of a list of twenty "works of Māra," the Buddhist personification of evil or anti-Dharma, states:[82] "Carrying out service [**vaiyāpṛtya*] of need to the [secular] world [**loka*], but not seeking after great learning [**bāhuśrutya*], is the work of Māra." This passage is quoted in the *Sūtrasamuccaya* scripture anthology, and with reference to this expression Ratnākaraśānti's late tenth-century commentary on the *Sūtrasamuccaya* explains:[83] "Thus, as for those who feel zeal for the inferior, since [this is caused] by property [**vastu*], [the sūtra] says 'carrying out service of need to the [secular] world,' because the perfect Buddha is born from great learning, not born from concern with property [**vastuparigraha*]." In other words, Ratnākaraśānti, a later scholastic author, reads the text as considering involvement in service, or that directed toward the world, in any case, to be objectionable, since it is not conducive to awakening. We already saw precisely this idea, in these same words, expressed in scripture in a passage we quoted earlier from the *Adhyāśayasaṁcodana-sūtra*.[84] It is interesting that these passages contrast service not with meditative cultivation, but with (the results of) study, therefore implicitly giving priority to learning, in contrast to many passages of

82. Textual Materials 18. I confess that I cannot understand the Chinese translation here well.

83. Textual Materials 19.

84. See Textual Materials 2, and p. 19 above.

an otherwise similar nature noticed previously, which hierarchically privilege meditation over study.

Although not easy to identify in this literature, relatively little of which survives in Sanskrit, the word *vaiyāpṛtyakara* does appear in Mahāyāna scriptures, not limited to the *Ratnarāśi* or those scriptures already quoted above. In the *Bodhisattvaprātimokṣacatuṣkanirhāra*, for instance, it is not specified that the *vaiyāpṛtyakara* is a monk, but instead we find reference to the **vaiyāpṛtyakara bodhisattva*. This passage conforms to the picture we have already begun to paint of the sorts of things to which the term *vaiyāpṛtya*, "service" or "administration," may refer. Four things, it is said, are the means toward unexcelled, complete awakening for bodhisattvas:[85]

1. the teaching, and knowing the teaching
2. charity and knowing charity
3. knowing the task of the administrator
4. knowing the pursuit of great learning

Regarding the third item, the text says:[86]

> How, Śāriputra, should one recognize the administrative bodhisattva? He should administer in conformity with the Teaching, and administer the Tathāgata's shrine. He should also be respectful toward scholars and ācāryas. He should be active in the application of energy in such a way that until the very end of his life he should remove sloth and torpor. Śāriputra, this is what the administrative bodhisattva should do.

While the wording here leaves open the possibility that this *vaiyāpṛtyakara* may be other than a monk, the general expectations agree very well with what we have seen in other texts.

Although their respective phrasings differ somewhat, and although the eleventh-century Dīpaṅkaraśrījñāna Atiśa is credited as the Tibetan translator

85. Textual Materials 20.

86. Textual Materials 21. The passage was identified by Fujita 1988: 120 according to a reference in the *Śikṣāsamuccaya*, the sense of which is however not precisely the same. We may translate the Sanskrit in the *Śikṣāsamuccaya* as follows (Textual Materials 22):

> When one is engaged in service [*vaiyāpṛtya*] one should be skillful in avoidance of the unprofitable. For service is set forth in the *Bodhisattvaprātimokṣa* as preaching the doctrine and worship of the Tathāgata in conformity with the teachings.

Immediately following this sentence, the *Śikṣāsamuccaya* offers a lengthy quotation consisting of the bulk of chapter 4 (¶¶2–17) of the *Ratnarāśi* which, it says, expands on what is meant here by "engagement [*vṛtti*]" in service.

of the *Bodhisattvaprātimokṣacatuṣkanirhāra*,[87] the Tibetan title of which is *Byang chub sems dpa'i so sor thar pa chos bzhi sgrub pa*, other quotations from the same text make it certain that the text quoted under the title *Bden pa'i rnam pa'i mdo* in Atiśa's scripture anthology *Mahāsūtrasamuccaya* is indeed the *Bodhisattvaprātimokṣacatuṣkanirhāra*.[88] All other quotations of this text cited by Atiśa agree perfectly with the version preserved in the Kanjur,[89] but the wording in this particular passage differs significantly. The quoted passage reads:[90]

> In that regard, who is the **vaiyāpṛtya* bodhisattva? He must do the tasks of the **vaiyāpṛtyakara* unwearied and without interruption for the stūpa of the Tathāgata, those who preach the teaching, scholars and ācāryas. Śāriputra, a bodhisattva should not perform service [**vaiyāpṛtya*] anywhere for even the slightest praise; he should not perform service from this sort of egotism. This is called knowing [what] service [is].

This portrait, no matter which version of it we select, has much in common with the picture painted in the *Ratnarāśi*, of an administrator mindful of his own qualities who seeks to care for the monastic community, its members, and its property.

If some of these Buddhist uses point to a humble status for the *vaiyāpṛtyakara*, such an interpretation is even more strongly suggested by the Jaina applications of what is, at least homophonically and homographically, the same term. Alongside *veyyāvacca* and *vaiyāpṛtya*, the Ardhamāgadhī form *veyāvaḍiya* also appears in the sense of "service, assistance."[91] An interesting comparison of the Jaina and Buddhist materials, and a study of the Jaina

87. As Fujita 1988: 129 points out, in the early catalog *Ldan dkar ma* (Lalou 1953: §259), this text is listed among Mahāyāna sūtras translated from Chinese. However, other references, such as the colophon, attribute the translation to Atiśa. It is certainly possible that there existed an old translation from Chinese, which was subsequently lost when the text became available directly from India. At present, however, no trace of the sūtra itself has been identified in Chinese.

88. The expression *bden pa'i rnam pa* appears in the sūtra itself (D 248, *mdo sde*, *za* 47b3, 48a2), but there is no indication that it is a title, and no listing of alternate titles is found in the text as we have it.

89. Quotations from the *Bden pa'i rnam pa'i mdo* in the *Mahāsūtrasamuccaya* were listed, but not identified, by Mochizuki 1999, but taken account of in the revision Mochizuki 2002b, in light of my identifications.

Quotations of the same sūtra in the *Śikṣāsamuccaya*, having been studied by Fujita 1988, were conveniently referenced in the Peking Kanjur by Matsumura 1990: 88n67.

90. Textual Materials 23.

91. See *Āyāraṅgasutta* 1.8.1.199; *Uttarajjhāyana* 12.24, 12.32 (*veyāvaḍiyaṁ karenti*); *Nāyādhammakahāo* 75.7, 127.10 (*veyāvaccakaraṁ ṭhaveṁti*). References are to the editions of the Jaina-Āgama series (Bombay: Shrī Mahāvīra Jaina Vidyālaya).

sources in particular, was offered by Colette Caillat.[92] She observed that *veyāvacca* in Jaina usage is service aimed at the expiation of the stain caused by sin. In a relatively early Jaina text, the *Vavahārasutta*, service is considered to be tenfold:[93]

> It is taught that service is ten-fold, namely: service to masters, preceptors, elders, initiates, the ill, penitents, co-religionists, families [of the masters], the sect, the community. A śramaṇa carrying out service to his master (preceptor, etc.) is an ascetic who greatly destroys [the karma he has] and greatly puts a stop [to future karma production].

The similarly early *Kappasutta* details the services to be performed by an ascetic being punished by isolation, namely, helping others to rise, follow, sit down, lie, and disposing of excretions, and it also refers to serving monks (*veyāvaccakara*) who assist in taking care of the body of a deceased monk.[94] Although it is clear here that this service applies to Jaina monks, it is equally clear that reference is not being made to any monastic office, and most certainly not to any sort of prestigious or highly responsible position. Rather, the opposite: this sort of service is humbling, to be undertaken as a penance or even, apparently, a punishment.[95]

On the other hand, according to the later *Bṛhatkalpasūtra-bhāṣya*, there are six types of monks unfit for survey work to determine suitable places for travel, of which the first is the *vaiyāvṛttyakara*.[96] This is because the absence of such monks causes hardship, in this case to those who are ill, since the *vaiyāvṛttyakara* cannot beg for their food or medicines if he is absent. The *vaiyāvṛttyakara*, should he be sent out, is requested to leave behind "a complete listing of pivotol families [*sthāpanākulāni*] specially devoted to the Order."[97] This gives the impression that the *vaiyāvṛttyakara* is responsible for lay-monastic relations with regard to material support, which seems to illustrate a radical difference between the roles of the *vaiyāvṛttyakara* in this Jaina context and that in some, or perhaps even all, Buddhist contexts.

92. See Caillat 1965: 130–134=1975: 112–115. Also see the entry in the *Abhidhānarājendra*, Vijayarājendrasūrīśvara 1934: 1451–1460.

93. Schubring 1966: 47, §10.35: *dasavihe veyāvacce pannatte taṁjahā: āyariyaveyāvacce uvajjhāya-v° thera-v° seha-v° gilāṇa-v° tavassi-v° sāhammiya-v° kula-v° gaṇa-v° saṁgha-v°. āyariyaveyāvaccaṁ karemāṇe samaṇe nigganthe mahānijjare mahāpajjavasāṇe bhavai*, and so on for the rest. My translation is indebted to those of Schubring 1966, and Caillat 1965: 131.

94. Edition in Schubring 1905, translation in 1910: ¶¶4.26 and 4.24.

95. In the old *Kappasutta "sāmācārī,"* we find reference to *āyariya-veyāvacca*; Jacobi 1879: 88 (§iv.20), trans. Jacobi 1884: 299.

96. Tatia and Kumar 1981: 46–47, referring to *Bṛhatkalpasūtra-bhāṣya* 1450–1470.

97. Tatia and Kumar 1981: 53–54 (*Bṛhatkalpasūtra-bhāṣya* 1466).

Although some Buddhist uses of the term *vaiyāpṛtya* that we have noticed seem to point to a similar humble status for the *vaiyāpṛtyakara*, there is also evidence in Buddhist sources which might be taken to point in another direction. One potential instance is found in a Gupta inscription, dated probably to 403 C.E.[98] This inscription, which is engraved on a rather large (forty-six-centimeter diameter) copper cauldron and records its donation, reads:

> In the year 83, in [the month] Māgha, the bright fortnight, the fifth day, dedicated by the *vaiyāvṛtyakara* Buddhadāsa to the community of monks belonging to the universal Sarvāstivādin [order] located at the Rādhika monastery in the park of Śibipura.

This inscription tells us several things. Such a copper vessel cannot have been inexpensive. So the *vaiyāvṛtyakara* Buddhadāsa was not a poor man. Moreover, the status he chose to record of himself for posterity, or rather for the sake of his merit, was that of *vaiyāvṛtyakara*.[99] I do not know exactly how to gloss the syntax of the compound *śibipuropavana-rādhika-vihāra-cāturdiśa-sarvāstivādi-bhikṣu-saṁgha*,[100] especially with regard to the place within it of *caturdiśa*, so my translation is tentative, but what is perhaps meant is that the gift is offered to a local chapter of the Sarvāstivādins.[101] In any case, it is not critical that we perfectly understand this portion of the inscription for the present discussion.

It is possible, but certainly not explicitly stated, that this Buddhadāsa may have been a *vaiyāpṛtyakara* of the Sarvāstivādins. If true, this would suggest that in a Sarvāstivādin context, *vaiyāpṛtyakara* could be a high status. On the other hand, it is far from clear whether Buddhadāsa was even a monk, not to mention a Sarvāstivādin monk.[102] If—and this may be a big if—he was a

98. Vogel 1921–1922; Shizutani 1979: Gupta §167; Tsukamoto 1996: 1000 (Shorkoṭ 1). The reading is Vogel's, but I write *ṣa* for *sha* and *ca* for *cha*. The translation is my own: *saṁ 80+3 māghaśukladi 5* [vai]*yābṛtyakara-buddhadāsotthāpi*[ta] *śibipuropavana-rādhika-vi*[hā]*ra-cāturdiśa-sarvbāstivādi-bhikṣu-saṁghasya* ||.

99. Notice that this early fifth-century Sanskrit inscription maintains what might be considered the Middle Indic variant, *vaiyāvṛtya*°, with *-v-* (written *-b-*). On the other hand, if our editions are reliable guides, later Nepalese manuscripts also commonly spell the word this way.

100. For simplicitiy's sake, I have standardized the orthography here.

101. Part of the trouble comes from our expectation that the universal monastic community of the four quarters, if divided along sectarian lines, would ipso facto not be universal. To unravel what is going on here will require further investigation.

102. While we have no onomasticon of Indian Buddhism, the name Buddhadāsa does seem—impressionistically, at least—like a monastic name; there is some support for this interpretation. A Mathurā inscription (Lüders 1961: §45 [pp. 81–82]; Tsukamoto 1996: 649–650 [Mathurā 33]; Lüders 1912: §40; Shizutani 1979: pre-Gupta 591) refers explicitly to a *bhikṣu* Buddhadāsa; another later inscription has the same, this time qualified as *śākyabhikṣu, ācārya* and *bhadanta* (Venkararamayya and Trivedi 1968: 148; Tsukamoto

monk, we might speculate that the status of *vaiyāpṛtyakara* so overshadowed his monastic position that he omitted to mention it or, perhaps going a step further, it was not possible for one to be a *vaiyāpṛtyakara* without being a monk, and it was therefore unnecessary for Buddhadāsa to mention it at all. But this is nothing more than one possible speculation.[103] Thus, what we actually *know* from this inscription is relatively little. We know that Buddhadāsa was a wealthy man, and we know that this wealthy man called himself *vaiyāpṛtyakara* in the context of his donation of a substantial item to a Sarvāstivādin community. We are also able to specify that the term *vaiyāpṛtyakara* was known and used in the early fifth century in the region of the Punjab. On the other hand, since according to at least some literary evidence, particularly that of the Prātimokṣas, an *upāsaka* could qualify as a *vaiyāpṛtyakara*, it is also possible that Buddhadāsa was, for instance, a wealthy *upāsaka* who qualified his status as donor with the title *vaiyāpṛtyakara* in this Buddhist sense. There is simply no way, given the presently available evidence, to resolve the question, and the fact that this epigraphical instance of the word is isolated, in fact unique among known sources, makes any speculation especially problematic.

The literary examples we have discussed are almost entirely unsystematic and even casual references, and as such have the value of permitting us a glance at what may be, to some extent, unreflective or "natural" uses of the term. However, certain texts also offer explict classifications, which reveal their apparently self-conscious understanding of *vaiyāpṛtyakara* as a special designation of an individual within the monastic structure. Just precisely what these texts understand by the term is, however, maddeningly unclear. Moreover, of course, it is not necessarily true that different texts share precisely the

---

1996: 695 [Phophnar Kalan 2]; Shizutani 1979: Gupta 201 [p. 231]); yet another refers to an *ācārya bhadanta* Buddhadāsa (Bloch 1895; Tsukamoto 1996: 529 [Waḷā 2]; Shizutani 1979: Gupta 173. Lévi 1896: 232 identifies this Buddhadāsa with one stated by Tāranātha to be a disciple of Asaṅga and uncle of Ārya-Vimuktisena; see Schiefner 1868: 82.7, 107.19. I can see almost no reason to accept this identification other than the coincidence of names and geographic locations.). We have the form in the feminine in a Mathurā inscription which refers to the nun (*bhikṣuṇī*) Buddhadāsī (Lüders 1961: §154 [pp. 189–190]; Tsukamoto 1996: 684–685 [Mathurā 114]; Shizutani 1979: pre-Gupta 651). What makes things problematic, however, is that we also have clear inscriptional evidence of the same name as an almost certainly nonmonastic one. In yet another Mathurā inscription (Lüders 1961: §65 [pp. 100–102]; Tsukamoto 1996: 656–657 [Mathurā 52]; Lüders 1912: §140; Shizutani 1979: Gupta 91), a Buddhadāsa is listed along with others such as Buddharakṣita, Saṃgharakṣita, and Buddhadeva, but all are explicitly mentioned as merchants, *vyavahārin*, and are therefore (almost without doubt), laymen. Therefore, it would be dangerous to make any assumptions about status on the basis of names alone. (The collection of names in Sankalia 1941–1942, while useful, does not, for instance, make any attempt to distinguish monastic and nonmonastic names. Incidentally, it is worth noting that the name element *-dāsa* need not in practice necessarily indicate a *śūdra* name, despite what the Dharmaśāstras stipulate.)

103. It is also possible, for instance, that we should look to localize this *vaiyāpṛtyakara* in the vocabulary of the legal literature, making the donor into an agent of some sort. There is nothing very compelling to suggest such an interpretation, but nothing to militate against it either.

same conception of the *vaiyāpṛtyakara*. An example of a schematized but nevertheless obscure use of the term comes from the *Manobhūmi* of the *Yogācārabhūmi*, which contains a list of sixty-four types of beings, from which we may extract and arrange one particular sequence for easier comparison:[104]

a. bhikṣu	dge slong	bìchú 苾芻
b. bhikṣuṇī	dge slong ma	bìchúní 苾芻尼
c. śikṣamāṇā	dge slob ma	zhèngxué 正學
d. śrāmaṇera	dge tshul	qìncènán 勤策男
e. śrāmaṇerī	dge tshul ma	qìncènǚ 勤策女
f. upāsaka	dge bsnyen	jìnshìnán 近事男
g. upāsikā	dge bsnyen ma	jìnshìnǚ 近事女
h. prahāṇika	spong ba pa	xíduànzhě 習斷者
i. svādhyāyakāraka	kha ton pa	xísòngzhě 習誦者
j. **vaiyāvṛtyakāra**	zhal ta byed pa	jìngshīrén 淨施人
k. sthavira	gnas brtan	sùzhǎng 宿長
l. madhya	par [*read* bar] ma	zhōngnián 中年
m. navaka	gsar bu	shǎonián 少年
n. ācārya	slob dpon	guǐfànshī 軌範師
o. upādhyāya	mkhan po	qīnjiàoshī 親教師
p. sārdhavihārin	lhun cig gnas pa	gòngzhùdìzǐ 共住弟子
q. antevāsika	nye gnas pa	jìnzhùdìzǐ 近住弟子
r. āgantuka	glo bur du lhags pa	jìnzhùdìzǐ 賓客
s. saṅghavyavahāraka	dge 'dun gyi las byed pa	yíngsēngshìzhě 營僧事者

We might suggest the following translations of these items, in some cases with some hesitation:

a. monk
b. nun
c. nun probationer
d. novice

104. The Sanskrit is found in Bhattacharya 1957: 48.11–14, with the corresponding Tibetan translation at D 4035, *sems tsam*, *tshi*, 24a3–5. The Chinese list is at T. 1579 (XXX) 289a4–10 (*juan* 1). Within the list of sixty-four items, those quoted here are 28–46. Although portions of its internal structure seem clear, I cannot understand the overall principle of the list's ordering. The lists in Sanskrit and Tibetan are actually given in the plural. For the sake of convenience, I cite the Sanskrit in stem form, and remove the plural *rnams* from each item in the Tibetan list. The Chinese does not indicate number. The only attempt I know to interpret this list is that of Hakamaya 1999. While much of his discussion does not convince me, this is not the place to debate his interpretation in detail.

e. female novice
f. layman
g. laywoman
h. meditator
i. reciter
j. administrator
k. senior monk
l. mid-seniority monk
m. junior monk
n. sponsoring instructor
o. preceptor
p. co-resident disciple
q. fellow-resident disciple
r. visiting monk
s. manager (?)

Even if its overall scheme remains obscure (to me, at any rate), parts of this ordering are nevertheless clear. Items a–g refer to classifications determined by ritual initiation—these seven are those who are ordained (monks and nuns) through those who have formally become lay followers. Items h–j appear to refer to vocational specializations, k–m to distinctions of seniority, and n and o to roles one undertakes in the guidance of junior monks.[105] Items p and q are relational terms with reference to one's colleagues (perhaps normally used by teachers to refer to their pupils), and r refers to the visiting monk (one not permanently residing in a given monastery). Item s again seems to be some sort of vocational designation. Two items in this list attract our particular attention in the present context. First, j, *vaiyāvṛtyakāra*, apparently grouped together with *prahāṇika* and *svādhyāyakāraka*, is rendered in Tibetan with the habitual *zhal ta byed pa*, but in Xuanzang's Chinese by *jìngshīrén* 淨施人, "one who purifies giving." As Hakamaya has pointed out,[106] this same grouping is found in the passage from the *Ākāśagarbha-sūtra* we noticed at the beginning of this study. It is quite likely that, as clearly in a–g and k–m, there is some implicit sequence here too, with the terms listed in a descending hierarchy.

The second point to notice is the interesting treatment of s, *saṅghavyavahāraka*, given in Tibetan as *dge 'dun gyi las byed pa* but in Chinese as *yíngsēngshìzhě*

105. See Sasaki 1997.
106. Hakamaya 1999: 155.

營僧事者.[107] The Chinese translation here is quite understandable, meaning "one who deals with the business of the monastic community." But it raises some questions with regard to other translations of *vaiyāpṛtyakara*, such as that in the *Ratnarāśi*, which employ the expression *yíngshì* 營事. It is necessary here to notice particularly the contrast afforded by Xuanzang's translation of *vaiyāpṛtyakara* by *jìngshīrén* 淨施人, literally "a person who purifies giving," which suggests an individual whose role is to receive gifts and make them acceptable—in other words, precisely the role specified for the *vaiyāpṛtyakara* in Niḥsargika 10. This must have been the model that Xuanzang had in mind here, despite its seeming unsuitability to this context, in which *vaiyāpṛtyakara* is (or seems to be) grouped with *prahāṇika* and *svādhyāyakāraka*, a conjunction I understand to evoke the three basic options for monastic vocations, namely, meditation, study, and service.[108]

In the same category of classified lists which include reference to *vaiyāpṛtyakara* we find the following categorization in the *Mahāvyutpatti*. This Indo-Tibetan glossary has, in general, extracted its classifications from canonical or para-canonical sources. Although its immediate scriptural source here, if there is a single one, has not been determined, the relevant list from the *Mahāvyutpatti* reads as follows:[109]

1.	8714	pravrajita	rab tu byung ba	renunciant
2.	8715	upasaṃpanna	bsnyen par rdzogs	ordained [monk]
3.	8716	śramaṇa	dge sbyong	ascetic
4.	8717	bhikṣu	dge slong	monk
5.	8718	bhikṣuṇī	dge slong ma	nun
6.	8719	śramaṇera	dge tshul	novice
7.	8720	śramaṇerikā	dge tshul ma	female novice
8.	8721	śikṣamāṇā	dge slob ma	nun probationer
9.	8722	mahallaka	rgan zhugs	aged monk
10.	8723	śikṣādattaka	bslab pas byin pa	pārājika penitent
11.	8724	upāsaka	dge bsnyen	layman

107. Hakamaya 1999: 159 has pointed out that the Tibetan does not appear to correspond to the Sanskrit here. It might be more cautious to say that the translation is nonstandard or interpretive.

108. The apparent background for Xuanzang's translation was also observed by Hakamaya 1999: 155.

109. The four-digit numbers are those of the edition of Sakaki 1916, but the spelling of Tibetan terms that found in Ishihama and Fukuda 1989. I cite the Sanskrit terms in stem form, although the text has them all in the nominative singular. I leave out of consideration the very late Chinese equivalents, and abbreviate the last six members of the list as irrelevant here: *kālpātrika, saṁjñābhikṣu, pratijñābhikṣu, bhikṣuta iti bhikṣu, bhinnakleśatvād bhikṣu, jñapticaturthakarmaṇopasaṁpanno bhikṣu*.

12.	8725	upāsikā	dge bsnyen ma	laywoman
13.	8726	poṣadhika	gso sbyong ba/ma	observer of the Poṣadha rite
14.	8727	upādhyāya	mkhan po	preceptor
15.	8728	ācārya	slob dpon	sponsoring instructor
16.	8729	karmakāraka	las byed pa[110]	manager of ecclesiatical acts
17.	8730	raho 'nuśāsaka	gsang ste ston pa	private instructor
18.	8731	niśrayadāyaka	gnas byin pa	provider of the [four] requisites
19.	8732	pāṭhācārya	klog pa'i slob dpon	reading teacher
20.	8733	sthavira	gnas brtan	senior monk
21.	8734	dahra/dahara	gzhon rabs	youth
22.	8735	navakarmika	lag gi bla	construction supervisor
23.	8736	**vaiyapṛtyakara**	zhal ta pa	administrator
24.	8737	śiṣya	slob ma	disciple
25.	8738	praśiṣya	yang slob	grand-disciple
26.	8739	antevāsin	nye gnas	fellow-resident
27.	8740	paścācchramaṇa	phyi bzhin 'brang/ 'brel ba'i dge sbyong	junior ascetic
28.	8741	madhya	bar ma	mid-seniority monk
29.	8742	navaka	gsar bu	junior monk
30.	8743	vṛddhānta	rgan rims/rim	older monk
31.	8744	navānta	gzhon rims/rim	younger monk
32.	8745	naivāsika	gzhi ba	resident monk
33.	8746	āgantuka	blo/glo bur du 'ongs pa	guest monk
34.	8747	gamika	'gro bar chas pa	traveling monk
35.	8748	āgamika	'ongs pa	visiting monk

110. The monk or nun responsible for eccesiastical acts is called *karmakāraka* in a number of texts. See Nolot 1996: 89 (§I.6), with references (but only to examples of the Sanskrit form). Important discussions are found in Kieffer-Pülz 1992: 423; Hu-von Hinüber 1994: 199–200; and Hirakawa 1982: 31, 58n23. As Hu-von Hinüber 1994: 200n1, points out, Pāli *kammakāra* is unrelated.

As an example of the Tibetan only, see the *Pravrajyāvastu* (Eimer 1983: 135.17–18, and Banerjee 1957: 114) with *las byed pa'i dge slong*. At Eimer 1983: 144.12 (Banerjee 1957: 123) and following, we find *dge slong las byed pa*.

The rationale behind the ordering of this listing, like that in the *Yogācāra-bhūmi*, remains obscure to me, lacking even the internal hierarchies we noticed in that previous list. As I have indicated graphically (along the left side of the list), there seem to be groupings encompassing 1–3; 4–8; 9; 10; 11–12; 13; 14–19;[111] 20; 21; 22–23; 24–29; 30–31; 32–35. Here, our attention should be directed particularly to items 22 and 23, *navakarmika* and *vaiyāpṛtyakara*. We find these two terms together again in another, in some ways similar, list, this one found in a comparatively early Mahāyāna scripture, the *Ugradattaparipṛcchā*. Although there are considerable differences between the versions of the list preserved in different translations of the sūtra, the Tibetan version has the following, with hypothetical Sanskrit equivalents listed in the right-hand column:[112]

a.	dge slong mang du thos pa	*bahuśrūtya bhikṣu
b.	dge slong chos brjod pa	*dharmabhāṇaka bhikṣu
c.	dge slong 'dul ba 'dzin pa	*vinayadhara bhikṣu
d.	dge slong ma mo 'dzin pa	*mātṛkādhara bhikṣu
e.	dge slong byang chub sems dpa'i sde snod 'dzin pa	*bodhisattvapiṭakadhara bhikṣu
f.	dge slong dgon pa pa	*āraṇyaka bhikṣu
g.	bsod snyoms pa	*paiṇḍapātika
h.	phyag dar khrod pa	*pāṁśukūlika
i.	'dod pa chung ba	*alpeccha
j.	chog shes pa	*saṁtuṣṭa
k.	rab tu dben pa	*pravivikta
l.	dge slong rnal 'byor spyod pa	*yogācāra bhikṣu[113]
m.	dge slong bsam gtan pa	*dhyānin bhikṣu
n.	dge slong byang chub sems dpa'i theg pa pa	*bodhisattvayānika bhikṣu
o.	dge slong lag gi bla	*navakarmika bhikṣu
p.	dge slong zhal ta byed pa	*vaiyāpṛtyakara bhikṣu
q.	dge slong dpon sna byed pa	(?)

111. See Sasaki 1997: 32.

112. The Tibetan is found at P 760 (19), *dkon brtsegs, zhi* 317b5–7; S 11 (19), *dkon brtsegs, ca* 28a7–b3; D 63, *dkon brtsegs, nga*, 274a5–7; the Chinese versions at T. 310 (19) (XI) 477a1–4 (*juan* 82), T. 322 (XII) 19a28–b3, T. 323 (XII) 27a21–25. Very helpful comparative lists of the three Chinese translations of the sūtra, the quotation in the Chinese translation of the **Daśabhūmivibhāṣā* (T. 1521 [XXVI] 63a [*juan* 8]), and the canonical Tibetan translation are found in Shizutani 1957: 433–434=1974: 368–369; Hirakawa 1968: 531–532=1990: 130–131; and now Nattier 2003: 347–351. The text is translated in Sakurabe 1974b: 278, and Nattier 2003: 276.

113. On this word, see Silk 2000, 1997.

The character of this list is somewhat different from those in the *Yogācārabhūmi* and the *Mahāvyutpatti*, but it shares with them, among other things, a cluster of administrative terms, the last three (o, p, q). One of the things we notice here is that both the *navakarmika* and the *vaiyāpṛtyakara* are explicitly termed monks (*dge slong*=*bhikṣu*). The corresponding equivalents in the several Chinese translations of this text are far from easily organized, but we may note that the translation of Saṅghavarman ends by following *zuòchánzhě* 坐禪者=**dhyānin* with *yíngshì* 營事 and *sìzhǔ* 寺主. The early translation of An Xuan 安玄 has *zuǒzhùzhě* 佐助者 and *zhǔshìzhě* 主事者, and the translation of Dharmarakṣa only *diǎnsìzhě* 典寺者. There is no way to clearly and surely coordinate the three Tibetan terms with these Chinese translations, the final item of the Tibetan list (q) being especially problematic.[114] A further passage in the sūtra itself offers brief comments on each of these items as glosses of a sort, but these unfortunately do not help us much. The list, found only in Tibetan, ends:[115]

> Basing himself on [the model of] the **navakarmika*, he should be energetic in his exertion to abandon all material objects [**vastu*]. Basing himself on [the model of] the **vaiyāpṛtyakara*, he should be energetic in doing what must be done. Basing himself on [the model of] the *dpon sna byed pa*, he should have an unwearied mental state [**aparikhinnamānasa*].[116]

As a final reference, and since the passage has been referred to by Hakamaya in this context, we may notice in Bu ston's fourteenth-century Tibetan account of the life of Nāgārjuna in his *History of Buddhism* (*Chos 'byung*)

114. Hirakawa 1968: 531–532=1990: 130–131 has translated *dpon* (misprinted in the 1990 edition as *dbon*) *sna byed pa* with *kankasha* 観化者; and Sakurabe 1974b: 278 with *sōin no shukan taru biku* 僧院の主管たる比丘. Hirakawa has perhaps just adopted as his "translation" the last item in the **Daśabhūmivibhāṣā* list, but the correspondence between that list and those in other versions of the sūtra is not straightforward, and the equivalent *kankasha* extremely problematic. Sakurabe's translation (something like: the monk who is superintendent of the monastery) is not obviously wrong, but the Tibetan literally means "the one in charge of various tasks," and no justification is given for interpreting the word anything but literally. Why the generally extremely careful Karashima 2001: 175 translates *dpon sna byed pa* as "a monk who is the head (of the monastery)," giving, without any indication of reconstruction, the Sanskrit equivalent *vihārasvāmin*, is not at all clear to me. I very much hope it is not due to my own misguided suggestion in Silk 1994: 238!

115. Textual Materials 24.

116. It is possible that the Indic-language original of this passage played somehow with the etymologies or associations of the relevant terms. For instance, *vastu*, in addition to meaning "material object" in Buddhist Sanskrit also means "site" (classical Sanskrit *vāstu*), and can be used in the sense of a building site. Building on a building site is, as we will see, precisely what a *navakarmika* does. I cannot, however, offer similar suggestions with regard to the other two items here. (The connections of the previous items in this list with their explanations are much more straightforward, if not tautological.)

mention of Nāgārjuna's having held an administrative post at Nālandā monastery. While, of course, no historical value can be attached to this allusion, and while moreover the reference appears in a work composed in Tibet, which may or may not reflect some recollection of an older Indian story, it is nonetheless interesting in that clearly the duties of the monastic community's **vaiyāpṛtyakara* (*dge 'dun gyi zhal ta ba byas pa*) were felt, at least by the great scholar Bu ston or his sources, to in no way conflict with the high dignity of the great Nāgārjuna. The passage reads:[117]

> Some time after [Nāgārjuna's ordination with the name Dpal ldan], when he had been made administrator of the monastic community of Nālandā, a great famine occurred. Dpal ldan got from the intermediate continent a gold producing elixir[118] and, causing it to produce gold, he procured the noon meals for the monastic community, so that they could pass the rain retreat. But the members of the monastic community asked: "How did you procure the noon meals for the monastic community at a time when, seeing people starving and dead, we abide [in a land] struck by famine?" And, when he told them about the manner [in which he procured the meals] as just mentioned, they said: "Without asking the permission of the monastic community, you engaged in fixing the monastic community in wrong means of livelihood. You must go from this place and, [in order to be purified from your guilt], construct ten million monasteries and shrines!"

How, in the end, are we to evaluate the title *vaiyāpṛtyakara*, and how understand the office and duties to which it points? Noriaki Hakamaya saw in the history and role of the *vaiyāpṛtyakara* an evolution from the early meaning of the term as indicating a humble lay status to that of a later sense pointing to a more elevated monastic status. He additionally adduced a connection with the Jaina usage of the word, which sees in *vaiyāpṛtya* the expiation of sin.[119] For my part, I see no evidence for this last sense in any Buddhist source. Setting aside the question of Jaina parallels, Hakamaya sees in the different Buddhist

117. Textual Materials 25. Noticed by Hakamaya 1993a: 24 (314) and 40 (298), n. 88=2002: 242 and 250n46. I have considerably modified the translation of Obermiller 1931–1932: II.123–124.

118. No doubt, this element in the story is connected with the legends of the individual who is distinguished, at least by some modern scholars, as the later alchemist Nāgārjuna. Cf. Ruegg 1981: 104.

119. Hakamaya 1996a: 71=2002: 322. As I argue below, I believe Hakamaya's appeal to the Jaina uses of the vocabulary is irrelevant since there is, in the first place, no reference in these texts to pollution caused by birth, which as we will see appears to be crucial to Hakamaya's argument, and second, because there is no evidence that Buddhist uses of the notion of *vaiyāpṛtya* resemble Jaina ones in this particular respect.

formulations—the two extremes—a historical development: for him, the *ārāmikas* and *upāsakas* of Niḥsargika 10 were permanent residents of the monastery; the *vaiyāpṛtyakara* was originally selected from among them temporarily, later becoming the permanent post which Hakamaya sees in the *Ratnarāśi*.[120] However, although there is a general similarity in the domains of some of their respective responsibilities, and although their titles appear in identical linguistic guise, I find no evidence which would permit us to directly connect the *vaiyāpṛtyakara* of Niḥsargika 10 with that of the *Ratnarāśi*. In sum, I do not believe Hakamaya has proved his suggestion that the tasks of the one are inherited from the other.[121] In my opinion, the most that might be said is that the *vaiyāpṛtyakara* in the Prātimokṣa has some sort of managerial role, as does the *vaiyāpṛtyakara* in the *Ratnarāśi*.

It is impossible to reproduce here the entire context within which Hakamaya has presented his notions, a context which involves ideas about the *ātman* theory, the rise of Mahāyāna Buddhism, sin and purification, and so on. In fact, there is much there I do not completely understand. But the fact remains that, in my opinion, Hakamaya has allowed certain presuppositions to permeate his arguments. For example, with reference to my own earlier mention of the possibility that *vaiyāpṛtyakara* may have been a high rank or status, Hakamaya wrote:[122]

> In a society of "custom" such as India with deeply rooted discrimination based on birth, it is difficult to easily believe that a *vaiyāpṛtyakara*'s station might be transformed into a "high rank" by becoming a monk and becoming able to manage the financial affairs of the monastic community.

Since I do not believe in the continuity that Hakamaya sees between the *vaiyāpṛtyakara* of Niḥsargika 10 and that of the *Ratnarāśi* in the first place, his criticism seems irrelevant to me. Moreover, I do not know that it has been in any way shown by Hakamaya or others that service to the monastic community of the type envisioned for the *vaiyāpṛtyakara* in Niḥsargika 10, namely, acting as an agent for the acceptance of donations, necessarily entailed any low status. If comparisons are useful at all, they might suggest on the contrary that submitting oneself to service toward members of a religious community increases rather than decreases one's social status, as it does in contemporary

120. Hakamaya 1993a: n. 49 = 2002: 244n7.
121. Hakamaya 1996a: 74 = 2002: 325–326.
122. Hakamaya 1996a: 71 = 2002: 321, referring to my suggestion in Silk 1994: 223, and see above.

Buddhist cultures and as is evident in the history of Christianity, for example. In addition, not only are there many different valences of social status at birth, but there is no evidence in the first place that a position such as *vaiyāpṛtyakara* is in any way connected with such social status denominators as class or caste (*varṇa* or *jāti*) determined by birth.

Regarding the matter of the permanence of such administrative roles, here too I find myself in disagreement with Hakamaya's presumptions. We have seen so far only one piece of evidence, namely, Yijing's translation of *dharmavaiyāpṛtya* incorporating the technical term *jiǎnjiào* 撿校, which I believe to be indicative of the temporary nature of this administrative role; we will consider further suggestive evidence below.

In this regard, and since *vaiyāpṛtyakara* is far from the only term for an administrative position in the Indian Buddhist vocabulary, before proposing generalized theories, the most prudent course may be to examine other terms of potential relevance. We may take our first step toward broadening the scope of our inquiry by looking at the *vaiyāpṛtyakara*'s neighbor in the lists we discussed above from the *Mahāvyutpatti* and *Ugradattaparipṛcchā*, in both of which we encounter the word *navakarmika*.

This page intentionally left blank

4

Navakarmika

The word *navakammika/navakarmika*, which has been noticed by scholars a number of times before,[1] appears in Pāli and Sanskrit Buddhist literature and in Indian Buddhist inscriptions. As far as I know, it has not yet been identified in non-Buddhist sources.[2] Apparently, there is only one occurrence of *navakammika* in the Pāli Nikāyas, in the *Saṁyutta-Nikāya*, where it refers not to a Buddhist but to a Brahmin, Bhāradvāja, who is described as having others perform work (*kammantaṁ kārāpeti*).[3] Buddhaghosa's commentary *Sāratthappakāsinī* explains:[4]

1. See in particular Konow 1940: 38–39 (to which I am indebted for several references to Pāli materials; Konow in turn was informed of these sources by Helmer Smith); Njammasch 1974; Inoue 1999. Edgerton 1953 s.v. *navakarmika*, while noting that Pāli *navakammika* is "said to mean repairer of buildings," and quoting Das's definition (Das 1902: 1203b) of the Tibetan equivalent *lag gi bla* as "one who does general menial service to the congregation of lamas in a monastery," nevertheless offered the wrong etymology of the word, suggesting "[p]erhaps lit[erally] (one who performs) new-initiate's work," due to his mistaken connection of this term with *nava*(*ka*), "newly ordained monk."

2. But note an eighth-century inscription from Hund (Udabhāṇḍa, more or less between Kabul and Srinagar) which contains in line 2 the word *navakarmapati*, in reference to the construction of a *devakula* (shrine); see Sahni 1938. It may be important that this inscription comes from the Northwest, the area where many of our Buddhist inscriptional instances of *navakarmika* are found. Note that the word *navakarman* is cited by Turner 1966: §6986 only for Pāli and Sinhalese (*navāma*).

3. Feer 1884–1898: i.179–180 (VII.2.7; the sutta is called Navakammika). In neither of the Chinese parallels is an equivalent to the term *navakammika* found: T. 99 (1182) (II) 319c13ff. (*juan* 44) (where the work itself is referred to as *yíngzuòtiányè* 營作田業 and *jīngyíngshìyè* 經營事業), and T. 100 (96) 407c21ff. (*juan* 5).

4. Woodward 1929–1937: i.264: *navakammikabhāradvājo ti so kira araññe rukkhaṁ chindāpetvā tattheva pāsādakūṭāgārādīni yojetvā nagaraṁ āharitvā vikkiṇāti iti navakammaṁ nissāya jīvatī ti navakammiko.*

> [The text speaks of] Navakammika Bhāradvāja. Since he makes his living by means of *navakamma*, consisting of having trees cut in the forest, preparing [the lumber] for [the construction of] palaces, halls, and so on, and taking it to the city to sell, he is called "*navakammika*."

(This reminds us, perhaps relevantly, of Buddhaghosa's second definition in the *Samantapāsādikā* of *veyyāvaccakara* as woodcutter, as we noticed above.) The principal verbs used to describe the activities of the *navakammika* are causatives: *kārāpeti* and, in the commentary, *chindāpetvā*. The implication that the *navakammika* is more a supervisor of the work of others than a laborer himself we will see reinforced repeatedly in other examples.

Although this is a unique example of this term in the Nikāya literature, in the Pāli Vinaya the word *navakammika* occurs several times.[5] In the *Cullavagga*, the Āyasmā Sudhamma is referred to as both *āvāsika* and *navakammika*, apparently in a monastery belonging to, or donated by, the householder Citta.[6] (We will study the word *āvāsika* separately below.) Other occurrences of *navakammika* in the Pāli Vinaya are clearer. In another discussion in the *Cullavagga*, the reference is quite clearly to construction, mentioning mud, bricks, and so on.[7] These construction activities (*navakamma*) are put in the charge of a *navakammika bhikkhu*, and the method of his appointment through the single declaration (*ñattidutiyakamma*) is set forth.[8] Much of this must refer to new construction, but there are also explicit references to the repair of damage

5. We may also note the occurrence of the word in the grammar of Kaccāyana. Discussing the *-ika* suffix, *nāvakammiko* (variant *nava°*) is offered as an example of a person in charge of some function. See Senart 1871: 391 (*taddhita* 8.8). This was noticed already by Hoernle 1882: 29, who with reference to a Bhārhut inscription (see below) defines *navakammika* as

> a term which indicates that he [the monk making the donation] had been recently appointed to his office of preacher [*bhānaka*]; it literally means: "one who has new work" (*nava+karma* and suffix *ika*). The term is explained in Kachchayana's *Grammar* . . . where it is said that the suffix *ika* is used to express appointment (*niyoga*) to an office, and where *navakammiko* is given as an example, "appointed to a new office."

Hoernle's definition is wrong, since he did not recognize *navakamma* itself as a technical term, not to be taken literally, or rather, etymologically. The sense, following Kaccāyana, is not "appointed to a new office," but rather "appointed to the office of [overseer of] construction work."

6. Oldenberg 1879–1883: ii.15.29–31 (I.18.1). Sudhamma is also called *dhuvabhattika*, on which see the Supplementary Note.

7. Oldenberg 1879–1883: ii.159–160 (VI.5.1).

8. Oldenberg 1879–1883: ii.160.10–21 (VI.5.2–3); see also ii.172 (VI.17.1), where however there is no mention of *navakammika*. To the latter passage we may compare one in the Dharmaguptaka Vinaya, T. 1428 (XXII) 944a9–945a19 (*juan* 51). The text refers to a monk who engages in *jīngyíng* 經營, management, and uses the word *jīngyíngrén* 經營人 and then later *yíngshì bǐqiū* 營事比丘. At c14–15, it is mentioned that the *yíngshì bǐqiū* 營事比丘 had not yet assigned the cells, which indicates a job description considerably wider than supervision of construction activities.

(*khaṇḍaphullapaṭisaṁkharaṇa*).[9] That this *navakamma* includes also new construction, rather than merely repairs, is also at least suggested by the narrative in the first *pārājika* of the Pāli *Bhikkhunīvibhaṅga*.[10] The donor Sāḷha wishes to build a monastery for the order of nuns, and subsequently the nun Sundarīnandā is assigned as *navakammikā*. Thus, the *navakamma* here must refer to new construction, rather than to the repair of an existing structure. It is worth remarking that, according to this passage, it was obviously also possible for a nun to undertake the duties of *navakammika*. Another Vinaya passage refers with the word *navakamma* to monks cutting down or having others cut down trees,[11] though it is not clear whether this is in connection with new construction or repair.

Equally unclear is a passage in the post-canonical Ceylonese *Jātaka* concerning Anāthapiṇḍika's construction on behalf of the community. He has monasteries (*vihāra*) erected every *yojana* (approximately nine miles) along the forty-five *yojanas* from Rājagaha to Sāvatthi, purchases Jeta's grove, and *navakammaṁ paṭṭhapesi*. Then he has a *gandhakuṭī* ("perfumed chamber") constructed for the Buddha in its midst.[12] Jayawickrama understands the crucial phrase as "and renovated the place," while Rhys Davids has "and erected there a new building."[13] It seems to me somewhat more likely that the expression which follows *navakammaṁ paṭṭhapesi*, namely, *so majjhe dasabalassa gandhakuṭiṁ kāresi*, may qualify it, so that indeed Rhys Davids is correct here: he erected a new structure and in its midst built a *gandhakuṭī* for the Buddha. (We note here again that the pertinent verb forms are causatives; Anāthapiṇḍika does not actually engage in construction activities himself, but has others perform them.)

In the similarly post-canonical Ceylonese *Dhammapada* commentary, in explanation of the expression "let them think it is my work alone," the text suggests:[14]

> The childish [monk] has this mistaken notion: "Let both householders and renunciants think that what has been done and completed is solely on account of me, thinking: 'Whatever *navakamma* has been done in the monastery, such as working on an/the *uposatha* hall, has all been done by our Elder.' "

9. Oldenberg 1879–1883: ii.172.12–13, ii.160.12. Exactly the same expression is frequently met with in inscriptions recording offerings to the monastic community for the upkeep of the physical plant of the monastery.

10. Oldenberg 1879–1883: iv.211. See now Shih 2000: 32ff.

11. Oldenberg 1879–1883: iv.34.3 (Pācittiya 11). On the issue of the prohibitions against monks digging the earth, cutting trees, and so forth, see Schmithausen 1991. The rule referred to here is cited at §5.3 (13).

12. Fausbøll 1877–1896: i.92.22.

13. Jayawickrama 1990: 125; Rhys Davids 1880: 130.

14. Textual Materials 26.

It may be, as Carter and Palihawadana have taken it, that new construction of an *uposatha* hall is meant, but I think that this is not entirely clear.[15] In one passage from the likewise Ceylonese *Visuddhimagga*, however, it is quite certain that *navakamma* refers to new construction. In a discussion of eighteen "faults" (*dosa*) a monastery might have, different sorts of monasteries are enumerated, and the problems for the meditation practitioner at each detailed. With regard to a new monastery (*navavihāra*), it is said: "In a new monastery there is much new building activity [*navakamma*]." A meditator might live in such a monastery, however, if there are sympathetic monks willing to undertake the tasks which otherwise might be assigned to him: "Let the venerable one do the ascetic's duties as much as he likes. We shall see to the building work [*navakamma*]." That this contrasts with repair work is clear from the immediately following entry concerning the dilapidated monastery (*jiṇṇavihāra*): "In a dilapidated monastery there is much that needs repair [*paṭiggitabba*]."[16] A similar conclusion may probably be drawn from another passage of Buddhaghosa, this in his *Samantapāsādikā* Vinaya commentary, which, in defining *āvāsika* ("resident monk"), states that such individuals are responsible for *navakammakaraṇapurāṇapaṭisaṅkharaṇādi*, "taking care of new construction, repairing dilapidated [structures] and so on." This appears to contrast the doing of *navakamma* with the repair of old and decayed structures, suggesting that here too *navakamma* indeed refers to new construction.[17] While the *Visuddhimagga* passage implies that those engaged in *navakamma* prepare the conditions for others to undertake spiritual cultivation, the spiritual benefits of engaging in such building activities oneself are stated by Buddhaghosa in his *Papañcasūdanī*.[18] There, the idea is attributed to scholars of old that *navakamma* allows one to eliminate

15. Carter and Palihawadana 1987: 158:

> Whatever new work has been done in the monastery, such as the building of an uposatha hall, [in regard to that] this thought arises in the childish [bhikkhu]: "Let both lay persons and those who have gone forth regard that all this was done, was completed, solely on account of me, thinking, 'It has been done by our Elder.' "

The past participles here are noncausatives. In the *Manorathapūraṇī* (Walleser 1924: i.31.15), we find the same idea, but with the causative: *ekacco navakammiko hoti uposathāgārabhojanasālādīni kāreti*.

16. *Visuddhimagga*, Warren and Kosambi 1950: IV.4–5, trans. Ñyāṇamoli 1956: 123: *Navavihāre bahuṁ navakammaṁ hoti . . . āyasmā yathāsukhaṁ samaṇadhammaṁ karotu, mayaṁ navakammaṁ karissāmā ti . . . jiṇṇavihāre pana bahuṁ paṭiggitabbaṁ hoti*. Cf. also III.45, which is somewhat less clear (Ñyāṇamoli 1956: 95).

17. Takakusu and Nagai 1924–1947: iii.613.29. I will return to this passage below.

Similar or related words no doubt appear in later works as well. In the *Thūpavaṁsa*, for instance, placed by von Hinüber 1996: §192 in the thirteenth century, we find an Arhat Thera given to a king as supervisor of construction, *navakammādhiṭṭhāyakaṁ adāsi* (Jayawickrama 1971: 188.29, and trans. 52).

18. Woods and Kosambi 1928: ii.91: *porāṇakapaṇḍitā pana navakammaṁ katvā pi vitakkaṁ pacchindiṁsu*.

stray thoughts (*vitakka*). The story is then told of the *sāmaṇera* Tissa, who is instructed to improve a cave (*leṇakammaṁ niṭṭhāpesi*) in which he dwells meditating. Here, it seems plain that it is not the direction or administration of others who do the actual labor that is described. Rather, the benefits of this construction activity derive from the personal work of the individual. This is an interesting recognition of the calming effect that physical labor can have and may typologically, although surely not historically, have some similarity to later Zen-type ideas of the value of physical labor. We need to clearly notice here, however, that this scenario almost certainly belongs to a Ceylonese, rather than a mainland Indian, setting. As Schopen has pointed out, since monks in India almost never lived in natural caves, references like this probably point to a particularly Sri Lankan situation.[19] Therefore, the direct relevance of such a description for an understanding of the idea of *navakarma* in India proper is questionable.

The canonical *Cullavagga*, to return to a text with a greater claim to Indianness, allows the appointment of monks to a position of responsibility for *navakamma* for different periods of time, ranging up to twelve years, but it is clearly stated that lifelong appointment is not possible.[20] The text also specifies that the appointment must be made to a monk within the *sīmā* or monastic boundary, which I understand to mean that the one in charge of some construction work within a certain designated monastic residence must be one attached to the community dwelling in that residence.[21]

The word *navakarmika* appears a considerable number of times in the Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya.[22] In many of these passages, he is clearly an individual responsible for construction-related activities. Rules six and seven of the Saṅghāvaśeṣa offenses in the Prātimokṣa govern a monk's efforts to construct a *kuṭī* (six) or a great monastery (*mahallaka vihāra*; seven).[23] In the illustrative examples in the Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya, the individual responsible for the construction of these structures, and who is thus to make sure the site

19. Schopen 1994b: 151–153.

20. Oldenberg 1879–1883: ii.172.21–30 (*Cullavagga* VI.17.1). We may compare here a passage in the Mahīśāsaka Vinaya (T. 1421 [XXII] 169a7–22 [*juan* 25]), in which monks who construct a dwelling (or have it constructed; the text says 諸比丘經營作僧住處) are evicted by a visiting monk (**āgantuka*). The Buddha ordains that a *jīngyíngzhǔ* 經營主 may live in a dwelling as he wishes for up to twelve years. Here, *jīngyíngzhǔ* 經營主 is evidently equivalent to the Pāli text's *navakammika*. In the **Vinayamātṛkā-sūtra* (?T. 1463 [XXIV] 824b23–c5 [*juan* 4]), the term used is *yíngshìrén* 營事人, but since he is appointed by a monk, this *yíngshìrén* himself seems not to be a monk. The passage also mentions the twelve-year residence. (The sectarian identification of this text remains unsettled; see the discussions in Hirakawa 1970: 263–264, and Clarke 2004: 87, 91n62.)

21. Oldenberg 1879–1883: ii.173, 6–10 (*Cullavagga* VI.17.2). See Kieffer-Pülz 1992: 124–125 (§9.1.2).

22. See now Schopen 2006.

23. See Durt 1983 on the "great monastery."

is proper, is stated to be the *navakarmika* (*dge slong lag gi bla*; *yíngzuò bìchú* 營作苾芻).[24] Here, on the one hand, the activity of the *navakarmika* clearly concerns new construction. On the other hand, in their explanations, most Vinayas do not define the monk who accepts this responsibility; only the Mūlasarvāstivāda and Mahāsāṁghika Vinayas specify that the monk undertaking such construction is a *navakarmika*, perhaps suggesting that undertaking such activity did not, ipso facto, make or label one a *navakarmika*, or that the term's usage in this context is sect-specific.

The Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya's treatment of the rule Pātyantikā 11 is particularly interesting, and one episode is worth translating in full:[25]

> The Buddha was dwelling in the Agrāṭavika Wood in Āṭavikā. The Blessed One having said that a monk must not have trees cut down, the *navakarmika* monks left off building activities because there was no wood. Since the Buddhas-Blessed Ones ask although they know, the Buddha-Blessed One asked the Venerable Ānanda: "Ānanda, why have the *navakarmika* monks left off building activities?"
>
> [Ānanda answered:] "Reverend, since the Blessed One has said that a monk must not have trees cut down, the *navakarmika* monks, without firewood[?],[26] left off building activities."
>
> "Ānanda, I will state the rules of customary behavior [*āsamudācārikāṁ dharmāṁ prajñāpayiṣyāmi]. When a *navakarmika* monk is going to cut a tree, for seven or eight days [before] he must construct a *maṇḍala* at the base of that tree, offer incense, flowers, food offerings [**bali*], recite the *Tridaṇḍaka*,[27] express the transfer of

24. The basic rule is found in Banerjee 1977: 17; in Tibetan in Vidyabhusana 1915: 82–83. The example is found in D 3, *'dul ba, ca* 241b7–243b7; T. 1442 (XXIII) 688c10–689a23 (*juan* 12). The illustration for Saṅghāvaśeṣa 7 is found in D 3, *'dul ba, ca* 250a3–251a4, but is missing in Chinese. The rule is discussed in Hirakawa 1993a: 436–468, and see Schmithausen 1991: 26, §10. The Mahāsāṁghika version at T. 1425 (XXII) 276c20–277c6 has *yíngshì bǐqiū* 營事比丘, which is equivalent to *navakarmika* in the one instance we can cite from the *Bhikṣu-prakīrṇaka* (see below).

One may compare in this regard a passage in the Mūlasarvāstivāda *Bhaiṣajyavastu* referring to five allowable places which the monastic community may use for food storage. Unfortunately, the text is not entirely preserved in Sanskrit, and many problems remain. See Textual Materials 27.

25. Textual Materials 28, translating the Tibetan text. This rule is discussed in detail in Schmithausen 1991: 5–22 (§§4–7), and Hirakawa 1994: 163–176, although neither refers to the *Vinayasūtra* quotation discussed below. The episode was noticed more than 125 years ago by Schiefner in Ralston 1882: liii.

26. Tibetan *zhugs shing* is defined by Zhang 1985 s.v. as *me shing*, *xīn* 薪, *caíhuǒ* 柴火, namely, firewood. The Chinese translation of the passage has *wúmùkěqiú* 無木可求, "there is no wood [we] can seek." Something seems to be wrong with the Tibetan text; the meaning should obviously be "because we do not have any wood."

27. Some attention has been paid to this reference, concerning which see Schopen 1992a: 231–233n62 (who discusses what is known of the *Tridaṇḍaka* generally); Sasaki 1971 (and strangely, very close to this, Tokiya 1985); Tokiya 1986: 24.

> merit,[28] devote himself to the paths of the ten good activities [*daśa-kuśalakarmapatha], state the disrepute [*avarṇa] of the paths of the ten bad actions [*daśākuśalakarmapatha], and having said so, he must proclaim: 'Whatever divinity is dwelling in this tree, please look for another location. This tree will be used by the stūpa, or the dharma, or the monastic community.' After that, in seven or eight days he shall have that tree cut down. If [the deity] shows distress [*vikāra], you shall not have it cut down; if not, you shall have it cut.[29] If the *navakarmika* monk acts without adopting the statement of the rules of customary behavior, he becomes guilty of a sin [*yathāprajñaptān āsamudācārikāṁ dharmān na samādāya vartate sātisāro bhavati*].'

Here again, it is obvious that it is the *navakarmika* monks who are responsible for the organization and supervision of construction, for which they need raw materials, specifically wood. Yijing's Chinese translation once more impresses us with its seeming inconsistency: what the Tibetan text suggests stood several times as *navakarmika bhikṣu* is rendered by Yijing *shoùshì bìchú* 授事苾芻, *yíngzuò bìchú* 營作苾芻, and apparently *shoùshìrén* 授事人, while *navakarma* is *yíngzào* 營造 and *yíngzuò* 營作. The terms *shoùshì bìchú* 授事苾芻 and *shoùshìrén* 授事人 might be translated "supervisor [monk]" or more literally "one/the monk who instructs [others] concerning tasks," thus further reinforcing our impression of the supervisory nature of the *navakarmika*'s role. We notice, by the way, that in the Mahāsāṁghika Vinaya version of this rule, the introductory story speaks of the tree cutting and so on as being done by the *yíngshì bǐqiū* 營事比丘.[30] We will see that there is good reason to believe that this term may well represent *navakarmika* throughout this Vinaya.

It is of great interest that the bulk of this account from the commentary to Pātyantikā 11 is given virtually verbatim in Sanskrit in Guṇaprabha's *Vinaya-sūtra*. This may be translated as follows:[31]

28. Chinese: a respected elder monk (*zhǐsù bìchú* 耆宿苾芻) should make the **dakṣiṇā anumodana* (*tèqīná* [EMC dək-kʰi-nɛː] *zhòuyuàn* 特欹拏呪願).

29. The Chinese has:

> If, when you cut the tree, [it/the god] manifests a transformation in countenance, you should praise the merits of donation and explain the transgression of greed. If, then, it [still] manifests the transformation in countenance, you should not cut it. If there is no change in countenance you may cut it.

30. T. 1425 (XXII) 339a6ff. (*juan* 14).

31. Textual Materials 29. Noticed by Schopen 1994a: 541. This rule, like others, is also treated in the *Vinayakārikā*, D 4123, *'dul ba, shu* 26b4=T. 1459 (XXIV) 633b21 (*juan zhong*). This text, not much explored by modern scholarship so far as I know, requires careful investigation. The auto-commentary to the *Vinayasūtra* at D 4119, *'dul ba, zhu* 186b4–187a1 is not very useful here.

> A *navakarmika* may have a tree cut down for the sake of the stūpa or monastic community. First, for seven or eight days before that, he must construct a *maṇḍala*, offer perfumes, flowers, lamps, incense, and food offerings, recite the *Tridaṇḍaka*, and express the transfer of merit [saying]: "[You] the divinity residing in this tree must look for another abode. This tree will be used by the stūpa or the monastic community. Being thus addressed, understand [the situation] through my explanation." If it should be noticed that [the deity or the tree] shows distress, that it catches fire, bleeds, its branches shake, its leaves are sickly,[32] or so on, regarding this point [the *navakarmika*] should praise and criticize [respectively] generosity and stinginess. If [the tree or the deity] does not permit it, you should not cut it.[33]

As has been noted in detail by Schmithausen,[34] there are interesting and important ecological implications of this passage, but for our purposes these implications are less relevant than the fact that here the *navakarmika* monk is that individual who is directly responsible for all matters connected with construction activities on behalf of the monastic community.

The Mūlasarvāstivāda rule numbered as Pātayantikā 73, which in the Pāli and Dharmaguptaka Vinayas is number 10 and immediately precedes the rule we have just examined, bars monks from digging the earth. In explaining this rule, the Mūlasarvāstivāda *Vinayavibhaṅga* allows that, if no *kalpakāra* or "legalizer" is nearby, and the astrological conjunctions are correct, a *navakarmika* monk may drive a stake into the ground to a depth of four fingers.[35] This passage

32. There are several rare words here. The first, *agnimokṣa*, does not appear in dictionaries, although Schmidt 1928: 7a cites *agnimocana* from the *Yaśastilakacampū*; Tibetan *me 'byung ba*, a literal rendering of *agnimokṣa*, also does not appear in dictionaries. What exactly might be meant by the tree catching fire (in protest?) is not clear to me. Likewise, the form *śaṭana* does not seem to be attested, although the root and several forms are cited in Schmidt 1928: 341a, again from the *Yaśastilakacampū*. Here, Tibetan *lo ma lhags pa* for *patraśaṭana* is hard to understand; *lo ma = patra* is obvious, but it appears as if the translators may have read **śīta(la)* for *śaṭana*(?). The reference may be to sick leaves or to leaves that have been shed from the tree. The word *rudhirasyanda* probably simply means bleeding, and in this case it may point to excessive flow of sap or some other liquid as can occur if trees are cut out of season, although some trees may exude sap directly from their leaves, as I have observed with the laurel, for instance. According to Jäschke 1881: 49a, the Tibetan translation of *rudhirasyanda*, *khrag 'dzag po*, is "the plain undisguised expression" for menstruation, but other dictionaries simply define the term as dripping blood or bleeding; Jäschke's definition may be a colloquialism. Similar expressions do not appear to be found in the literature of the Vṛkṣāyurveda, on which see Das 1988. I thank Rahul Peter Das for his remarks on this passage.

33. I translate this sentence on the basis of the Tibetan, as emended following the commentary; I do not understand the Sanskrit. The commentary (Textual Materials 30) suggests that if the flow of sap and so forth does not stop, this indicates that one may not cut the tree.

34. Schmithausen 1991: 5–22 (§§4–7).

35. Textual Materials 31. With respect to this rule, the *Vinayasūtra* (Sankrityayana 1981: 57.33–58.1, 2.4.73) says: *muktvā caturaṅgulamātrakīlakanikhananaṁ navakarmikasya nakṣatrayogenāsannihitakalpakārasya*.

further confirms our impression that the *navakarmika* is that monk responsible for (supervising) construction, whether it be repair or new construction. But this is not the whole story, and other passages might point in another direction. In the *Cīvaravastu* of the same Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya, we find the following:[36]

> The scene was in Śrāvastī. At that time, a *navakarmika bhikṣu* died. The monks, because of their hesitation,[37] did not divide his robe and bowl. The monks explained the situation to the Blessed One, and the Blessed One said: "Gathering the whole monastic community, it must recognize whether he was one who mixed up [the possessions in his charge] or not." If he was a mixer, and made goods belonging to the community into those belonging to the stūpa, or those belonging to the stūpa into those belonging to the community, this is unlawful. His robe and bowl together with the price of his robes are to be divided into three, those of the Buddha, those of the Dharma, and those of the monastic community. The monks should divide those belonging to the monastic community. With those belonging to the Buddha worship of the Buddha or repairs [*navakarma*][38] to the *gandhakuṭī* or stūpa are to be performed. With those belonging to the Dharma the Buddha's word is to be copied, or it is to be applied to the lion's throne [of the preacher].[39] If he was not one who mixed up [the possessions in his charge],[40] the entirety [of his possessions] are to be divided by the monks, and they should have no hesitation in this regard.

D 4117, *'dul ba, wu* 45b5–6: *lag gi blas rgyu skar gyi sbyor bas rung bar byed pa med na thur ma sor bzhi tsam 'jugs pa ma gtogs so* ||. The auto-commentary in D 4119, *'dul ba, zhu* 265a2–4 is not useful here.

On this rule, see Schmithausen 1991: 46–51 (§15), and Hirakawa 1994: 149–157. Again, neither of them note the *Vinayasūtra* passage.

36. Textual Materials 32. This passage is referred to in the *Vinayasūtra* (Sankrityayana 1981: 85.19–20, §6.1.94) as follows: *ratnādīyitvaṁ saṁbhāvena yāvadbhya etat tāvatsu nāvakarmikasya* viniyogaḥ samaṁ* (*Edition sic *nā°*). The Tibetan translation is in D 4117, *'dul ba, wu* 68b3: *lag gi blas dkon mchog gi blangs pa nyid yin na de'i ji snyed pa de snyed mnyam par bsab bo* ||. The *Vinayasūtra* passage is commented on with reference to the *Cīvaravastu* in D 4119, *'dul ba, zu* 129b7–130a6.

37. Note the use of *kaukṛtya*, usually something like "remorse," but as I understand it here "hesitation."

38. I do not quite understand the unusual Tibetan rendering here: *lag gi bla'i sar spyad par bya'o*. It seems to combine *navakarmika=lag gi bla* with *nava=sar*(?). Also, *spyad par bya'o* seems to presuppose some form of √*car*, rather than √*kṛ*. Note that *navakarma* in the Sanskrit text here is masculine.

39. The Tibetan translation has here "the lion's throne is to be ornamented." No doubt, this is also the meaning of the Sanskrit.

40. The manuscript reads *na ced asaṁbhinnakārī*, but the Tibetan has *gal te 'dres par ma gyur na*, which must be correct. Dutt, without note, has printed *na cet sambhinnakārī*.

Here, this *navakarmika* seems to be an administrator responsible for financial matters, rather than (or, in addition to being) one responsible for (the supervision of) construction or repair per se. The concern that the *navakarmika* might have been sloppy at bookkeeping does not suggest one solely concerned with the maintenance of the physical plant of the monastery. I understand the potential worry here to be that the *navakarmika* may have been involved in fraud or embezzlement, hence the concern that a mere distribution of his goods might create, as it were, a situation in which the monks become party to trafficking in or receiving stolen property. If correct, this interpretation casts a certain light on the authors' expectations of the reliability of such a *navakarmika*. It is also possible, however, that this passage should merely be understood in something like the context of a passage in the Pāli *Cullavagga*, in which it is specified that a monk to whom construction responsibilities have been given should not make (personal) use of the property of the monastic community.[41] In Guṇaprabha's auto-commentary to his *Vinayasūtra*,[42] he explicitly states with reference to this passage that the mention of the *navakarmika* should be understood only as an illustration, implying that the rule is generalizable, as one would indeed expect.

There is, however, at least one other indication pointing toward the fiscal responsibilities of the *navakarmika*. In a passage in the *Vinaya Uttaragrantha* of the Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya mentioned earlier, the Buddha is made to say that it should be the **navakarmika bhikṣu* who, with the permission of the senior monks, arranges for loans on behalf of the monastic community, rather than a **vaiyāpr̥tyakara bhikṣu*.[43]

Some passages suggest the *navakarmika*'s special status, without specifying it. In illustrating Niḥsargika 14, the Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya introduces a story dissimilar to those in the other Vinayas.[44] To explicate the rule that monks may renew their rugs only once every six years, and the exceptions to this rule, the Mūlasarvāstivāda story has the monks afflicted by a chilling wind. As a result, the *navakarmika bhikṣu* is unable to carry out his *navakarma*. Thus, although the required six years have not passed, he is in need of a new rug. While there is no specification of the *navakarmika*'s

41. Oldenberg 1879–1883: ii.173.4–5 (*Cullavagga* VI.17.2): *na bhikkhave navakammaṁ gahetvā saṁghikaṁ paṭibāhitabbam*.

42. Textual Materials 33.

43. See above p. 56, n. 69, referring to Schopen 2001: 115–116. We note here the Tibetan rendering of *navakarmika* (*bhikṣu*) as *las gsar du byed pa*(*'i dge slong*).

44. D 3, *'dul ba, cha* 131b2–132b7; T. 1442 (XXIII) 736c1–28 (*juan* 21). See Hirakawa 1993b: 270–285. The passage is alluded to in the *Vinayasūtra* auto-commentary, D 4119, *'dul ba, zhu* 157b5.

duties here, the vocabulary in the Chinese translation is of interest. The word *navakarmika bhikṣu* is rendered in Tibetan here with *dge slong lag gi bla*. The corresponding Chinese translation, however, uses three different renderings within the space of this short passage: *zhīshì bìchú* 知事苾芻, *yíngzuò bìchú* 營作苾芻, and the composite *zhīshì yíngzuò bìchú* 知事營作苾芻, of which the first once again conveys only the general sense of "administrative monk," literally, "one who manages affairs/duties." The Tibetan translation renders the term **navakarma* itself with *las sar pa*, which the Chinese has as *yíngzuò* 營作.[45] We have already seen evidence that such variation is typical of Yijing's translation style.

There are additional examples of passages pointing to the special status of the *navakarmika*, and the accomodations which might be made on his behalf. In the *Bhaiṣajyajavastu* of the Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya, in the context of a discussion of what sort of gifts might be accepted by travelers, we find that five types of persons might accept rice and molasses (*guḍaudana*): one who has taken to the road, one who is hungry, one who is ill, an *upadhi-vārika*, and a *navakarmika*.[46] The meaning seems to be that those who cannot take advantage of ordinarily available food may use this irregular source. A close parallel to this expression, though without the key word *navakarmika*, seems to confirm this understanding. In the *Pūrṇāvadāna* of the *Divyāvadāna*, we find the Buddha telling Mahāmaudgalyāyana:[47] "There are five types of alms food for extraordinary circumstances. What are the five? That of the visitor; that of the traveler; that of one who is ill; that of one who nurses the ill; that of the

45. Tibetan *las sar pa* is attested as a translation of *navakarma* in the *Vinayasūtra*: D 4117, *'dul ba, wu* 72a1–2: *gal te ma yin nam ka ba la na las sar pa'i phyir ro* || = *na cet stambhe ca navakarmaṇe bhūmau* (Sankrityayana 1981: 88, §6.2.97 [auto-commentary at D 4119, *'dul ba, zu* 140a7]); D 4117, *'dul ba, wu* 78a5: *dang po so phag 'grems pa'o* || *phyis las sar pa dang bcas pa nyid do* || = *prathamāṣṭakānyasya mānatvamūrdhva*[*ṁ*] *sanavakarmatvam* (Sankrityayana 1981: 95, §8.1.180). See the auto-commentary at D 4119, *'dul ba, zu* 163a5–164a1.

46. Dutt 1939–1959: i.249.7–8: *adhvapratipannaka*, *bhaktacchinnaka*, *glānaka*, *upadhivārika*, and *navakarmika*. In Tibetan in D 1, *'dul ba, ga* 32a6 (without Chinese parallel). (The passage is referred to in the *Vinayasūtra* 8.1.9–10 [Sankrityayana 1981: 92.18–20]; D 4117, *'dul ba, wu* 75c7, with the commentary at D 4119, *'dul ba, zu* 153a2–3.) This passage has been noted by Ch'en 1953: 379, who observes inter alia that the context as a whole is reproduced in the *Meṇḍakāvadāna* of the *Divyāvadāna*, this passage, however, being omitted.

47. Cowell and Neil 1886: 50.26–28: *pañca me maudgalyāyanātyayikapiṇḍapātam | katame pañca | āgantukasya gamikasya glānasya glānopasthāyakasyopadhivārikasya ca* |. Trans. in Tatelman 2000: 76. Tatelman observes, 93n158, that *ātyayikapiṇḍapāta* "refers to a meal taken in a manner or at a time . . . which violates strict Vinaya regulations, but which irregularity is justified by circumstances." As noted by Edgerton 1953 s.v. *ātyayika*, the word was already discussed by Burnouf 1844: 628–629. One should compare here Pāli *acceka-cīvara*, and see the discussion in Horner 1938–1966: ii.151–152n6. Regarding the next sentence, *asmin tv arthe bhagavān upadhau vartate*, Edgerton 1953 s.v. *upadhi* (3) observed correctly that the Buddha is here acting as an *upadhi-vārika*.

upadhi-vārika."[48] These items have correspondences elsewhere.[49] Two facts are of interest to us here. First, *navakarmika* is linked with the administrative title *upadhi-vārika*, which we have seen and will notice again in more detail below, and appears to be at least structurally parallel to the term which stands in its place in the second list, *glānopasthāyaka*, a common term for those who undertake nursing responsibilities. Importantly, this is perforce a situational responsibility and not a vocation or permanent post. Second, the implication here is that the duties of the *navakarmika* are such that he might not be able to follow the usual routine of the daily monastic schedule, so that supplementary meals should be provided.[50] This suggests, in line with other evidence, that the *navakarmika* has administrative responsibilities, as does an *upadhi-vārika* or a nurse for the ill, which would compel him to disregard the regular monastic daily schedule or routine.

There are a considerable number of further references to the *navakarmika* in the Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya,[51] but those we have cited should suffice to make clear his multiple responsibilities. He was primarily involved with construction activity but also clearly had, at least on some occasions, some opportunity to take charge of financial matters, hence the concern shown in the passage from the *Cīvaravastu* that his accounting practices may not have been entirely transparent.

48. Here, the Chinese translation (T. 1448 [XXIV] 16a5 [*juan* 4]) renders the last term *shòushì zhī rén* 授事之人, very similar to one of the equivalents Yijing uses elsewhere for *navakarmika*, while the Tibetan (D 1, *'dul ba*, *kha*, 5a2) has its more or less standard equivalent of *upadhi-vārika*, *dge skos*. The same reference is found in the *Vinayakārikā* (Textual Materials 34), where **upadhi-vārika* (*dge skos*) is translated in Chinese by *jiǎnjiàorén* 撿挍人, a term we have noticed as having the technical sense of (one given a) temporary assignment.

49. For instance, in the lists of the seven *puṇyakriyāvastu*. These have, however, not always been understood entirely correctly. The *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya* ad iv.117 reads in Xuanzang's translation (T. 1558 [XXIX] 96b16–18 [*juan* 18]): 如七有依福業事中先說應施客、行、病、侍、園林、常食、及寒風熱、隨時衣藥 (Taishō text: 食等). La Vallée Poussin 1923–1931: iv.237n1 misunderstood Xuanzang's version as follows: "Dans les sept *aupadhikapuṇyakriyāvastu*, il dit qu'on doit donner à l'*āgantuka*, au *gamika*, au *glāna*, au *glānopasthāyaka*, à l'*upadhivārika* (yuên-lîn-tch'ang); qu'il faut réchauffer celui qui a froid." Something has gone wrong here, with only six items in the enumeration. Moreover, *chángshí* 常食 ("constant food source," **dhruvabhikṣā*) is the adverb object of *shī* 施, and thus there is no such word as La Vallée Poussin's "yuên-lîn-tch'ang" 園林常. By itself, *yuánlín* 園林 clearly means *ārāma*, as it does at 80b5. La Vallée Poussin also points to the list in the *Mahāvagga* 8.15.7 (Oldenberg 1879–1883: i.292.10–11) which contains the first four items: *āgantukabhatta*, *gamikabhatta*, *gilānabhatta*, *gilānupaṭṭhākabhatta*; and see the passage in the Mūlasarvāstivāda *Vinayavastu* which parallels the *Vyākhyā* (D 3, *'dul ba*, *nya* 143b3–144a3; T. 1442 [XXIII] 882c28–883a2 [*juan* 46]), pointed out and translated by Hakamaya 1995: 75, 93n131. See the discussion in the Supplementary Note.

50. This seems a hypothesis more in keeping with evidence of his supervisory capacity than the alternative, but also possible, suggestion that his physical labors might qualify him for some supplementary sustenance.

51. We note that an entire subsection of the *Vinayasūtra* is devoted to *navakarma*, found at Sankrityayana 1981: 112.17–31 (§17.2.3), translated in Tibetan at D 4117, *'dul ba*, *wu* 93b6–94a6, with the commentary at D 4119, *'dul ba*, *zu* 253a7–255b2. Other remarks on *navakarma* may be found in the same commentary at *zu* 153a5–164a1.

Other Vinayas, existing almost entirely only in Chinese, do not allow us to make the same type of close investigations of vocabulary that are possible with the Theravāda Pāli and Sanskrit Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinayas. However, although the text proper is preserved only in Chinese, we know that the Mahāsāṁghika Vinaya contains under the title *yíngshìfǎ* 營事法 a section called *navakarmika-pratisaṁyukta*, since the Sanskrit key word of the section is preserved in the "index," *Bhikṣu-prakīrṇaka*.[52] Here, the text speaks of a **navakarmika bhikṣu* constructing a cell (*zuòfáng* 作房). In another place, the text warns that monks should not overly engage in administrative affairs.[53] If we are permitted to generalize from this instance to assume that the same Chinese vocabulary consistently renders *navakarmika* everywhere in the same Vinaya, which is likely but not absolutely certain, we find it implied that a **navakarmika bhikṣu* would be in a position to employ (*gù* 雇) various artisans, including potters (*taóshī* 陶師), plasterers (*níshī* 泥師), painters (*huàshī* 畫師), and handymen (*yīqièzuòshī* 一切作師), and to engage transport by cart, horse, ox, donkey, or human,[54] or again to employ tilers and plasterers.[55] The **navakarmika bhikṣu* is said also to have undertaken to produce mud bricks, although such activity is subsequently prohibited by the Buddha,[56] and to dig the ground in order to hide many possessions of the stūpa and the monastic community, here apparently not with any illicit intention.[57] This may suggest that some of his duties include looking after the wealth of the community and the stūpa. The *yíngshì bǐqiū* 營事比丘 elsewhere in this Vinaya makes others carry mud on their backs "like slaves."[58] In illustrating the sixth Pātyantika[59] rule of the Prātimokṣa, in which it is forbidden to preach verse by verse to those who have not yet received ordination (**upasampadā*, *jùjiè* 具戒), a **navakarmika bhikṣu* is criticized by the Buddha for preaching the *Pārāyaṇa* verse by verse (*jùjù shuō bōluóyēnà* 句句說波羅耶那) to a group of children, but this does not imply, of course, that teaching others was necessarily among his permissible responsibilities.[60]

52. T. 1425 (XXII) 445a4–b5 (*juan* 27). For the key term, see Roth 1970: §294, No. 32. Sasaki 1994: 63 seems to have overlooked this list of Sanskrit terms in preparing his very useful outline of this section of the Mahāsāṁghika Vinaya. Ironically, this unique passage in which we can accept with some confidence that the term *yíngshì* 營事 corresponds to *navakarmika* is overlooked by Inoue 1999: 858 (167) in his list of Mahāsāṁghika Vinaya occurrences of *yíngshì* 營事.

53. T. 1425 (XXII) 277c7 (*juan* 6).

54. T. 1425 (XXII) 313b8–11 (*juan* 10).

55. T. 1425 (XXII) 365b3–4 (*juan* 17).

56. T. 1425 (XXII) 384c10–21 (*juan* 19), and see Schmithausen 1991: 46–48 and the notes.

57. T. 1425 (XXII) 385a14–17 (*juan* 19), and see Schmithausen 1991: 49–50 and the notes.

58. T. 1425 (XXII) 494b25–c7, and c7–15 (*juan* 33).

59. In this school, the word should rather be spelled *pācattika*, but I use the recognizable form here.

60. T. 1425 (XXII) 336c5–17 (*juan* 13). The passage was translated in Lévi 1915: 422–423, but he inexplicably translated *yíngshì bǐqiū* 營事比丘 as "un moine résidant," which should render **āvāsika*, a distinct term

The term *navakarmika* appears in literary contexts other than the Vinayas as well. For instance, in Āryaśūra's poem the *Jātakamālā* we find the expression *āvāsikaḥ so 'stu mahāvihāre kacaṅgalāyāṁ navakarmikaś ca*, which I provisionally understand to mean "be a caretaker monk resident in the great monastery at Kacaṅgalā, and [its] *navakarmika*."[61] The various modern renderings of this verse are interesting. It was translated by Speyer as "have his residence in the Great Monastery, entrusted with the charge of the reparation in [the town of] Ka*k*aṅgalā."[62] It was again translated more recently by Khoroche with "may he be caretaker and surveyor of the fabric in the great monastery at Kacaṅgalā."[63]

There is also a Pāli parallel to this verse in the *Jātaka*,[64] which has been translated:[65] "The great Kajañgal cloister be his care, and may he set the ruins in repair." As Konow has pointed out, the *Jātaka* commentary refers to a vast, old (and thus dilapidated) monastery near Kajaṅgalā in which, in the days of the Buddha Kassapa, a monk did repair work.[66] It is interesting to remark that the commentary does not use a causative verb here in describing the monk's action of performing *navakamma*, possibly implying that the commentary's author expected that he would have done the work himself.[67]

The word *āvāsika* in this verse is somewhat more problematic than it might appear (and we recall from its mention above that in the *Cullavagga* the Āyasmā Sudhamma is likewise referred to as both *āvāsika* and *navakammika*). While Speyer has taken *āvāsika* as roughly "resident monk," which is quite

---

we will discuss below. On the *Pārāyaṇa*, see this excellent study of Lévi's, passim. On the Vinaya rule, see Hirakawa 1994: 92–104.

At T. 1425 (XXII) 344c27–345a13 (*juan* 15), a *yíngshì bǐqiū* 營事比丘 uses water containing insects to sprinkle on the grass and bare ground. This is used in illustration of Pātyantika 20 (on which, see Hirakawa 1994: 254–262).

61. XIX.21ab. Text in Kern 1891: 113.

62. Speyer 1895: 161. We may also note Speyer's first attempt at the verse 1893–1894: 489: "He who has failed against thee for the sake of the lotus-stalks, may have his residence in the Great Monastery, perform the nine works in Kacangalâ and make the window[s] in [as many] days." His early misunderstanding of *nava-* as nine here is interesting, and in light of his superb knowledge of Sanskrit, a warning to us all.

63. Khoroche 1989: 124. In Japanese, Hikata and Takahara 1990: 182 have rendered: 蓮根を得んと欲して貴方に対し失敗した者は、大寺院に住む者となり、カチャンガラー [Kacaṅgalā] [という町]で新建築の監督者となり、日毎に窓を一つ作るであろう.

64. On the relation of the two jātakas in the Jātakamālā and Pāli *Jātaka*, see Charpentier 1910.

65. *Jātaka* §488, iv.310.13–14: *āvāsiko hotu mahāvihāre navakammiko hotu kajaṅgalāyaṁ*, trans. Cowell et al. 1895–1907: iv.196. It has also been translated in Japanese, somewhat less poetically, by Kamimura Katsuhiko in Nakamura 1982-1991: vii.32: そのものは大精舎における住職となれ。カジャンガラー市における[寺の] 創立者となれ.

66. Konow 1940: 39 referring to Fausbøll 1877–1896: iv.311.26–28: *kassapabuddhakāle kajaṅgalanagaraṁ nissāya yojanike jiṇṇamahāvihāre āvāsikasaṁghatthero hutvā jiṇṇavihāre navakammaṁ karonto.*

67. But note that the commentary is, of course, a Ceylonese composition and may therefore represent a situation at variance with that in mainland India.

possible, we will see below that there is also some ground for understanding it as "caretaker," as Khoroche has it, or as signifying that the monastery is in the monk's care.[68]

Although apparently rare in this genre of literature, we do find the word *navakarmika* at least once in a Mahāyāna sūtra in Sanskrit, namely, in the *Rāṣṭrapālaparipṛcchā*. There, future bad monks are criticized in the following terms:[69]

> Abandoning meditational trance as well as study, they work constantly as functionaries carrying out the monastery's affairs [*vihārakarman*]. Greedy for sitting mats, frowning, they are surrounded by undisciplined disciples. [They say:] "I am the *navakarmika* here in this monastery;[70] I built it for myself. There is room in this monastery for those monks who are faithful to me." To those who are precept keepers, full of virtue, upholding the teaching, devoted to people's welfare, always intent on controlling and restraining themselves, they give no friendly attention. [They say:] "This cave-cell is designated as mine, and this one for my fellow practitioner, and this one for my companion. Get out! There is no dwelling here for you. The sitting mats and bedding are completely given out, many monks are already staying here, and there is no possibility to obtain any possessions here. What will you eat here? Get out, monk!" There will never be any request [to the community] for sitting mats and bedding from them [because they will take them at their leisure]. Storing up things like householders, they will have numerous items of merchandise, and numerous followers.

The first thing we may notice about this passage is that it alludes in its first lines to the controversy we noticed at the outset of our study concerning

68. On the other hand, the sense of Khoroche's "surveyor of the fabric"—in which fabric no doubt means material structure—is not quite clear to me even as English.

Note that *āvāsika* certainly does not mean that the individual in question is the abbot or head priest, the normal sense of Japanese *jūshoku* 住職, for which see the translation quoted above. Likewise, Japanese *sōritsusha* 創立者 means something like "founder," a sense which also seems to be unjustifiable, even if the implication is that the *navakarmika* is the person who built the monastery in the first place, in the sense of being responsible for its actual construction. *Shinkenchiku no kantokusha* 新建築の監督者, "director of new construction," is no doubt much closer to the mark.

69. Textual Materials 35. The Chinese translations are found in T. 310 (18) (XI) 463c3–17 (*juan* 80); T. 321 (XII) 7a19–23 (*juan* 2) (much omitted).

70. Finot 1901 printed the text 31.3 as *na ca karmiko*. The Tibetan translation at Ensink 1952: 91.9 reads *lag gi bla*, however, and it is no doubt upon this basis that Shackleton Bailey 1954: 81 suggested the correction *navakarmiko*. In addition, T. 310 (XI) 463c6 (*juan* 80) has *bǐ èbǐqiū shèzào sì* 彼惡比丘設造寺. This was not taken into account either by Ensink 1952: 30 or by Sakurabe 1974a: 177.

the status of study, meditation, and administration. For the author(s) of the *Rāṣṭrapālaparipṛcchā*, quite clearly, as for the authors of a number of other scriptures we have discussed, the former two occupations are superior to the third. But beyond the implication that the *navakarmika* was responsible for constructing the monastery in the first place (and even that is not entirely sure from this passage),[71] there is little other specification here of the duties or position designated by the title. It seems almost certain, however, that the term does refer to some monastic position, rather than one held, for instance, by a lay servant, since the passage as a whole is concerned with monks.

One of the remarkable facts about the term *navakarmika*, in contrast not only to the term *vaiyāpṛtyakara* but also to virtually all other examples of Indian Buddhist monastic administrative vocabulary, is its relatively frequent appearance in inscriptions. While these inscriptions come from many different areas of the Indian subcontinent, the term's use is, interestingly, concentrated in earlier examples. These inscriptional uses clarify some matters, but leave others obscure.[72]

An inscription from Nāgārjunakoṇḍa dated to the third century of the common era records the construction, *navakamma*, of the pillar on which it is engraved by three *navakammika*, *imaṁ navakaṁmaṁ tiṁhi navaka*[*ṁ*]*mikehi kāritaṁ*, the names of all three of whom are suffixed with *-thera*, indicating, of course, their monastic status.[73] Here too, as we saw in literary examples, the relevant verb is in the causative, implying that the three *navakammika* had the actual work of construction done by others. In a Kaṇheri inscription,[74] we find

71. He is responsible either in the sense that he built it himself, or that he had it built for him. It seems possible to understand the Sanskrit as saying that the *navakarmika* had the monastery built for him or on his account, *ātmanahetur eṣa hi kṛto me*. (Tibetan renders this [Ensink 1952: 91.10]: *bdag gi ched du 'di ngas byas te*.) Whether this makes him into the *vihārasvāmin*, the owner of the monastery (Schopen 1996), the text does not say. Note that inscriptions routinely use the verb √*kṛ* (in the causative) to indicate the foundation or construction of a monastery.

We may also refer here to a passage in the *Sarvadharmāpravṛttinirdeśa* (Braarvig 2000: 125, 406v4) which states that a monk established a monastery: *sa vihāraṁ pra*(*tiṣṭhāpay*)*i*(*tvā*). The Tibetan translation (127.5) has *des gtsug lag khang cig brtsigs nas*, meaning that he constructed it. The significance of this is, however, not fully clear to me.

72. Some of the inscriptions referred to in the following have been treated by Njammasch 1974, but many of her interpretations, and sometimes even her acceptance of the basic readings, leave something to be desired. Inoue 1999 has only very casually referred to a number of inscriptions. Cf. also Reddy 2005.

73. Vogel 1933: 22–23 (Second Apsidal Temple inscription F); Tsukamoto 1996: 331–334 (Nāgārjunakoṇḍa 41); Shizutani 1979: pre-Gupta §704. The cited expression occurs near the end of the rather long text. Here, it seems clearly to be the inscription itself, or perhaps the pillar and its inscription, that is the *navakamma* for which the *navakarmikas* are responsible, not the gift it records.

74. Bühler in Burgess 1883b: 75–76 (No. 4), with estampage on plate LI; Tsukamoto 1996: 415–418 (Kaṇheri 5). The photographs in Gokhale 1991: 50 are useless, his reading and translation likewise. Shizutani 1979: pre-Gupta §464; Lüders 1912: §987.

the sequence *nava /// kā pavajito therā*, followed by a series of individuals whose names are prefixed with *bhadaṁta*. It looks to me, from the estampage, that perhaps three *akṣara*s are lost at the end of the line after *nava*, but it might be two, in which case the reconstruction [*kami*] or [*kama*] would be attractive.[75] We recall that also in the Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya passage cited above, commenting on the rule Pātyantikā 11, *navakarmika* monks are referred to in the plural, a fact which suggests that at least with regard to this title, multiple individuals could be so designated simultaneously. These individuals in this inscription are also given elite monastic titles, which we likewise find applied elsewhere. A Bhārhut inscription, for instance, records the gift of a pillar by a *bhadata aya* (Sanskrit, *bhadanta ārya*) who is a *bhānaka* (*bhāṇaka*) and *navakamika*.[76] A Sonāri inscription of perhaps the second century B.C.E. records the gift of the *navakamika* Dharmagupta, pupil (*antevāsin*) of Ārya-Prasanaka; another pupil of this same teacher records his own gift on the same railing, referring to himself only as *bhikṣu*.[77] It is possible that *navakamika* should be taken as a more specialized designation here, which assumes that the holder of the title is already a *bhikṣu*, but again, we cannot be certain. The occurrence of *navakamika* with elite titles such as *thera*, *bhadanta*, and *ārya* may suggest its high status as well.

There are a number of references to our term in Kharoṣṭhī inscriptions from the Northwest.[78] Despite some ambiguities with the overall interpretation, it seems that the copper-plate inscription of Patika of uncertain date refers to an individual named Rohiṇimitra as *navakamika* in (? *saṁgharame navakamika*) a monastery the establishment of which the inscription itself records.[79] In the Māṇikiāla Stone inscription, dated to the eighteenth year of

75. Bühler has translated "an ascetic, the Thera, the reverend Achala," and so on, noting: "It is difficult to offer a plausible conjecture for the restoration of the end of line 15. I think of *nava-kaṁmaṁ*, which must have been followed by the name of the *pavajito*, the last syllable of whose name *kâ* (read *ko*) is preserved in l. 16." I do not agree with this, and think it is more likely that Tsukamoto is correct that we read a series of plurals, *pavajito* being an error for **pavajitā*.

76. Lüders 1963: 38 (A 59); Tsukamoto 1996: 574–575 (Bhārhut 88); Shizutani 1979: pre-Gupta §217; Lüders 1912: §773. Cf. also Lüders 1963: A 60; Tsukamoto 1996: 580–581 (Bhārhut 109), which may be related, but is far too fragmentary to speculate upon.

77. Cunningham 1854: 313; Tsukamoto 1996: 938–939 (Sonāri 1, 2). Both inscriptions seem to be known only from eye-copies, but there is no reason to doubt the readings. Shizutani 1979: pre-Gupta §1702; Lüders 1912: §154.

78. For a remark on the evolution of the phonological realization of forms of the term in Kharoṣṭhī, see Fussman 1989: 487 (§37.6).

79. Bühler 1896–1897; Konow 1929a: 23–29 (XIII); Tsukamoto 1996: 1006–1007 (Taxila 1); Shizutani 1979: pre-Gupta §1786. On controversy surrounding the date, see Salomon 2005: 372. Konow may be right that line 5, containing the reference to *navakamika*, is a later addition, to be read with line 3, but his speculations, p. 28, concerning the exact role of the *navakamika*, are less certain. Despite the suggestions of Fussman 1989: 455n32, I do not see how one can understand Rohiṇimitra to have been the *upadhyāya* (as he reads

Kaniṣka,[80] there are once again a number of ambiguities, but somehow the *navakarmiga* Budhila is involved with what seems to be the donation of several relics of Śākyamuni.[81] The donation is made together with others by a general, Lala, *dānapati* (called here by the Iranian term *horamurto*) in a monastery belonging to the Kṣatrapa Veśpasi. The status of Budhila and his relation to the donation are not clear. In Konow's opinion,[82] on both this and the Patika inscription, the reference to and name of the *navakarmika* have been added later, possibly by the *navakarmika* himself. What this later addition might indicate is not clear. Other early examples include a jar inscription from Haḍḍa, which refers to the *navakarmia* Saṁghamitra's donation of a relic deposited in a stūpa.[83] In an inscription dating to around the beginning of the common era from the area of Bajaur, near the Pakistan-Afghan border, we find the śramaṇa Dharmasena referred to as *ṇaveamio*, that is, *navakarmika* in one Kharoṣṭhī orthography of Gāndhārī Prakrit.[84]

---

uvajhae . . .) of the donor Patika. If correct, I believe that Patika would have to have been a monk, in which case we cannot explain why he is called *mahadanapati*. (As far as I know, a monk cannot be referred to as *dānapati*.) Fussman, however, has very kindly responded to my inquiries as follows (e-mail 22 April 2001):

> Vous avez trois solutions: ou Patika est un shramanera temporaire (comme les fils du roi de Thaïlande ou du Cambodge ont pu l'etre). Ou Patika est moine, et comme le moine Bala, assez riche pour faire des donations. Ou upadhyāya n'a pas le sens technique de "precepteur d'un jeune moine," mais celui bien attesté en sanskrit de "precepteur" (d'un prince, ou d'un fils de riche etc.).

I confess I remain unconvinced, but other explanations, for instance of Lüders and Bühler, referred to by Tsukamoto, are all for one reason or another also unsatisfactory.

80. What this means exactly in terms of fixed chronology remains controversial, but thankfully irrelevant for our purposes. Current thinking would place it around 145 C.E., but even if this is not correct, there is no question that it belongs to sometime in the first or second century C.E.

81. Konow 1929a: 145–150 (LXXVI); Tsukamoto 1996: 983–984 (Māṇikiāla 1); Shizutani 1979: pre-Gupta §1759. See also Lüders 1909. (For some important remarks on this and the immediately preceding inscriptions, see Salomon and Schopen 1984.)

82. Konow 1929a: 24, 149.

83. Although based on an eye-copy only, quite certain. The inscription has been discussed a number of times, importantly by Thomas 1915; Konow 1929a: 157–158 (LXXXII); definitively by Konow 1940; see also Tsukamoto 1996: 962–963 (Hiḍḍa 1); Shizutani 1979: pre-Gupta §1735.

84. Salomon 1997. I wonder, however, whether we need agree entirely with Salomon when he says (188):

> Although in Buddhist texts the corresponding term is usually understood to mean something like "builder, repairer of buildings," its use in inscriptions suggests that the *navakarmika* was in effect the supervisor of the construction of new stūpas and other cult structures, and of the ritual dedication thereof.

Salomon appears to be quite correct that the *navakarmika* was a supervisor of construction, which seems to be as true for the texts as for the inscriptions. But in the inscription edited by Salomon here, for instance, a number of figures and individuals, beginning with the buddhas of the past, future, and present and running through various historical figures, including kings and princes, are honored, *pūjita*. The concluding sentence, *dhrama(s)eno ṣamano ṇaveamio puyaïta*, is exactly parallel to those which precede it, mentioning

Considerably later than these inscriptions is a sealing from late medieval Nālandā which has been read as *Śrī-Nālandā-Mūlanavakarmmavārika-bhikṣūṇāṁ*.[85] I am unsure how we should understand this. In particular, the sense of *mūla*° is unclear to me. We might assume that *navakarma-vārika* is essentially equivalent to *navakarmika*, although this equivalence cannot be demonstrated.[86] We will see below that the term (or suffix) *vārika* itself has a number of relevant usages, though this particular compound seems to be uninstanced elsewhere.

Other inscriptions contain the term *navakarma*, but without specific mention of the *navakarmika*. In several virtually identical Āyaka–pillar inscriptions from Nāgārjunakoṇḍa dating from the beginning of the common era, we find mention of *navakamma* performed on—or constituting the construction of—a *mahācetiya* or great shrine. In this case, *navakamma* might mean either repair or new construction, although the latter seems more likely.[87] Much later, an eleventh- or twelfth-century inscription from Nālandā records various *navakarma* carried out by the monk Vipulaśrīmitra in a monastery of Pitāmaha (= Buddha), but again the monk is not called *navakarmika*.[88] A few lines later

---

those other figures. There is no indication here that this monk is responsible for the donation of the relic mentioned in this inscription, or for the setting up of the stone pillar which stood atop the deposit. Therefore, I do not quite see how this or other similar inscriptions really suggest the *navakarmika*'s role as supervisor of the ritual dedication of cult structures, although naturally I do not wish to suggest that there exists any evidence to the contrary either.

85. Sastri 1942: 37 (S. I, 1005; S. 4, 40). Cf. Karunatillake 1980: 61. Such sealings (and we have, in most cases, only the sealing, not the seal itself) indicate that the sealed item was owned by the sealer—in this case, the *navakarma-vārika* monks of Nālandā monastery (and see above on the problem of *mūla*°). There is as yet no satisfactory overall study of Buddhist seals and sealings in India, including textual references to such objects, but for the ground it covers, Callieri 1997 is superb. See also Thaplyal 1972: 206–222.

86. Another sealing has been read, with hesitation: *Śrīman-Navaka*[*rmmaṭhānām*?] *Traividyasya*, and translated: "Of the *Trivedī* [*Traividya*] of the famous *Nava-karmaṭhas*, those who were clever in superintending." However, a number of other sealings containing the term Traividya, published immediately after this, are apparently concerned with Brahmanical land grants. Given this and the uncertainty of the reading, the sealing should probably be considered of dubious relevance. See Sastri 1942: 55 (S. I, 691). I can make out nothing on plate VIIa. (On this sealing, see also Thaplyal 1972: 258.)

We may also note an inscription in which *navakarmika* was once read, but for which this reading has been rejected: see Aiyar 1925–1926a, read by F. W. Thomas with *navakaṁmi*[*asa*] in line 1, corrected by Konow 1929a: 152–155 (LXXX); Tsukamoto 1996: 978–979 (Kurram 1). See also the treatment of the inscription in Konow 1929b.

87. Vogel 1933: 17 (C1), 19–20 (C2); Tsukamoto 1996: 316–317 (Nāgārjunakoṇḍa 6), 320–321 (Nāgārjunakoṇḍa 14). The relevant phrase occurs twice in close succession: *imaṁ mahācetiya-navakaṁma*[*ṁ*] and *imaṁ navakamaṁ mahācetiyaṁ*. The first suggests the possibility of work being done on the *mahācaitya*, the second that it is the (construction of the) *mahācaitya* itself which is the work (*navakarma*) in question. That the two phrases are intended to be synonymous is a natural assumption, which suggests that it is indeed new construction which should be understood here.

88. Majumdar 1931; Tsukamoto 1996: 199–202 (Nālandā 9): *pitāmahasya vihārikāyāṁ navakarmma citraṁ*. The inscription was re-edited, with plate, and translated in Salomon 1998: 300–301, who understood *navakarmma citraṁ* as "excellent repairs." Salomon now tells me that he prefers "diverse."

in the same inscription, we encounter another reference to similar activity with the unusual form *navīnakarmma*, no doubt used for metrical reasons.[89] In this inscription, it seems clear that *navakarma* refers to repairs or renovations, rather than new construction. In another twelfth-century inscription from Gayā, the meaning of the word, amid much poetic verbiage, is hard to gauge.[90]

Inscriptions also record compound forms which are, as far as I know, so far unattested in literature.[91] One inscription from Amarāvatī refers to a monk, the Elder Venerable Buddharakṣita (*therasa bhayanta budharakhitasa*), a resident of Rājagiri (*rajagirinivāsikasa*), who is called *vetikā-navakamaka*.[92] He has a nun as his pupil (*atevāsin*), and thus it is probable that this Buddharakṣita is a senior monk of some standing. Sivaramamurti connects the term *vetikā-navakamaka*, which he translates as "overseer of the repair works of the rail," with a reference in Tāranātha's *History of Buddhism* to the effect that at the time of Nāgārjuna the railings at Amarāvatī were renovated.[93] I think this association is very questionable, but the railings referred to with *vetikā-navakamaka* (if the term has been correctly understood) may well be some railings at Amarāvatī.[94] Another Amarāvatī inscription refers to two individuals as *mahā-navakamaka*, one of whom may be called Buddharakṣita, but this is probably not the same individual as the monk in the previous inscription, since this one is called a resident of Pākagiri.[95] The name of the other *mahā-navakamaka* is qualified with *ārya*, and a third individual, Dharmarakṣita, is

---

89. Salomon 1998: 301 translates this term here "renovations," probably to distinguish it from "repairs," although the two are virtually equivalent.

90. Indraji 1881; Tsukamoto 1996: 162–165 (Gayā 2).

Other inscriptions provide less information. It is impossible to tell from the fragmentary Sirpur inscription of Ācārya Buddhaghoṣa what is meant: Jain 1971; Tsukamoto 1996: 936–938 (Sirpur 2).

91. It may be relevant to mention an expression in an apparently mid-ninth-century Brahmanical grant from the Northwest (Kielhorn 1896), in which we find the expression (ll. 19–20): *khaṇḍasphuṭitasaṁskaraṇāya abhinavakarrmakaraṇāya ca bhr̥̥tyapādamūlabhavaṇāya ca*. I have not seen the term *abhinavakarma* elsewhere.

92. Sivaramamurti 1942: 290 (No. 69); Tsukamoto 1996: 239–240 (Amarāvatī 49).

93. Schiefner 1868: 56.11–12, trans. Chimpa and Chattopadhyaya 1980: 107.

94. Hultzsch 1886: 346; Hultzsch in Burgess 1887: 53; and Lüders 1912: §1250 read *cetika*°, connecting the word *caitika* with the subsect of that name. However, I agree with Sivaramamurti, and after him Tsukamoto, that the correct reading must be *ve*°. When we look at the estampage in Burgess 1887, plate LVI 6, we find *va* very clearly in lines 1 and 2 (not so clearly in 4), and a very clear *ca* in line 6; the shapes are entirely distinct. Shizutani 1979: pre-Gupta §52. (The reading seems to be taken at face value in Shizutani 1978: 80, although he had access to Sivaramamurti's readings as is clear elsewhere.)

95. Chanda 1925: 274 (No. 55); Sivaramamurti 1942: 278 (No. 33); Tsukamoto 1996: 267–268 (Amarāvatī 139); Shizutani 1979: pre-Gupta §144. Chanda could not make much of the inscription, but F. W. Thomas added a more or less coherent reading, and an even more coherent one is found in Sivaramamurti. There is disagreement over the reading of both the name of the monk and the name of his residence; see the notes in Sivaramamurti and Tsukamoto.

referred to as *Sihagirinavakamaka*, the *navakarmaka* of Siṁhagiri. This donation was made together with one *upāsaka* and several women, whose status is not stated.[96] In an inscription from the Gandhāra region, we find the term *thuva-navakaṁmika*, which would stand in Sanskrit as **stūpa-navakarmika*, a designation we would naturally interpret as one responsible for the construction or repair of stūpas, or of a particular stūpa.[97] In another inscription dated sometime in the reign of Kaniṣka, there seems to be reference to two *aṁgiśalaṇavakamia*, Mahāsena and Saṁgharakṣita, apparently individuals in charge of the heated room (or "sauna") in some monastery in Kaniṣkapura. The donation was made to the Sarvāstivādin *ācāryas*, but I do not think this necessarily implies that the donors belonged to this sect, or even that these donors were monks.[98]

96. Another Amarāvatī inscription (Chanda 1925: 270 [No. 40]; Sivaramamurti 1942: 275 [No. 11]; Tsukamoto 1996: 223 [Amarāvatī 10]; Shizutani 1979: pre-Gupta §13) contains the term *navakamikā* followed by *padhāna-pari . . . ṇo*. This has been understood as "chief supervisor of the renovation work," but the whole is too fragmentary, in my opinion, to make much sense of.

An apparently ninth-century Kāṇherī inscription (West 1861: No. 54 and p. 12; Tsukamoto 1996: 443–444 [Kaṇheri 48]), available only on the basis of an eye-copy, has been read to contain the word *naumitakama*, identified by Gokhale 1991: 109 with *navakarmika*, and accepted as such by Tsukamoto. Even if the eye-copy of the now-lost inscription is correct, its reading is suspect, and the identification, it seems to me, impossible.

97. Sadakata 1996: 302–305; Tsukamoto 1996: 955 (Bajaur 8). Sadakata frankly stated his inability to explain the latter part of the inscription, which he read *thuvanavakaṁmike śirilenamatasa samadravanatasa aṁtevase aśorakṣidena masenavakaṁmike*. However, Richard Salomon 1997: 190n6, suggests reading rather *thuvanavakaṁmike śirile nama tasa samadro vana tasa aṁtevase aśorakṣide nama se navakaṁmike*. He then translates: "The superintendent of the construction of stūpas [was] named Śirila. His [disciple] was in turn (*vana*=Skt. *punar*) Samadra. His [Samadra's] disciple is named Aśorakṣida (Aśokarakṣita). He is the superintendent of construction [of this stūpa]." This is still not altogether fluid, but is certainly a tremendous improvement on the earlier reading, and perhaps as close as one may come to a coherent interpretation.

98. The inscription was first re-edited by Mukherjee 1964, after the casket was cleaned. This was improved then by Fussman 1987: 77–82. (The inscription had been much differently read earlier by Konow 1929a: 135–137 [LXXII]; Tsukamoto 1996: 993–994 [Shāh-jī-kī-Ḍherī 1]; Shizutani 1979: pre-Gupta §1775.) Fussman reads as follows (here *=line break): *acaryana sarvastivadina pratigrahe* | * . . . *jasa kani kaniṣkapure nagare ayaṁ gaṁdhakaraṁde* ⊥ * *deyadharme* | *sarvasatvana hitasuhartha bhavatu* | * *mahasena saṁgharakṣidasa aṁgiśalaṇavakarmiana ṣkasa vihare* |. Fussman translates:

> In the acceptance of the Sarvāstivādin teachers. [In the year *x* of the great king] Kani<ṣka>, in the town of Kaniṣka-pura, this perfume box is a sacred gift. May it be for the welfare and happiness of all beings. (Gift of) Mahāsena <and> Saṁgharakṣita, the service monks in charge of the fire room in the <.>ṣka monastery.

This is clearly a vast improvement on previous efforts. More recently still, Sadakata 1998 has proposed some rearrangement and subsequent reinterpretation of the inscription: *acaryana sarvastivadina pratigrahe* |* *deyadharme* | *sarvasatvana hitasuhartha bhavatu* |* *kaniṣkapure nagare ayaṁ gaṁdhakaraṁḍe* [*mahara*]*jasa Kaniṣkasa vihare Mahasenasa Saṁgharakṣidasa aṁgiśalaṇavakarmiana* |, with the translation

> In the acceptance of the Sarvāstivādin teachers. May [this religious gift—handwritten by the author on the offprint] be for the welfare and happiness of all beings. This perfume box is (a gift) of

Finally, in a sixth-century Viṣṇukuṇḍi inscription, a village is granted to the Buddhist monastic community by king Pṛthivīśrīmūlarāja with the following explanation:[99]

> And with my permission, King Harivarman, approving of the officer responsible for construction and operations resident in the Mahāvihāra [*mahāvihāranivāsinaṁ navakarmmavyāpārādhikṛtam anumatya*], gave with all exemptions [the village in question] to the superior community of monks of the four quarters who dwell now or will dwell in the future in the Mahāvihāra he himself established on the slope of Mt. Guṇapāsapura so that they might enjoy the four requisites.[100]

> Mahāsena and Saṁgharakṣita, the service monks in charge of the fire-room in the Mahārāja Kaniṣka's vihāra, in the city called Kaniṣka-pura.

However, there is no specific indication that the two individuals mentioned are monks, although the name Saṁgharakṣita suggests that he at least might be (but see the discussion of names above, p. 63, n. 102). Since we cannot be certain that a *navakarmika* need necessarily be a monk, it may be a leap to assume that since they are *navakarmika*, they are without doubt monks. Concerning the work being done, Fussman says (81), "As for Mahāsena and Samgharakṣita, they had to keep the fires alight and to dispose of the ashes, or to see that this work be regularly and well done." He refers to Upasak 1975: 2, who states, "A *Saddhivihārika* or *Antevāsika* is expected to keep the *Aggisālā* neat and clean." This is probably based on a passage in the Pāli Vinaya (Oldenberg 1879–1883: i.49,6=ii.210,3), but even if correct it does not prove that this is what the *aṁgiśala-ṇavakarmia* of this inscription did. (As Fussman points out, see also Burrow 1944 for the word *agiśala*. Note also that the word *agniśālā* is mentioned in the *Vinayasūtra* [Sankrityayana 1981: 114.27–28 (§17.10.231); D 4117, *'dul ba, wu* 95b3: *me khang*].)

99. Sankaranarayanan 1977: 186 (Godvari plates, set II), and Murthy 1971: 195 (with plates). Lines 21–24 read: *anena ca madanumatena harivarmmarājena mahāvihāranivāsinaṁ navakarmmavyāpārādhikṛtam anumatya guṇapāśapuragiritasvapratiṣṭhāpitamahāvihāranivāsyāgatānāgatacāturddiśāryyavarabhikṣusaṅgha-catuṣpratyayaparibhogārtthan dattas sarvvaparihāreṇa*.

100. Such expressions do not seem to be common, but it is interesting to note the very similar language in a sixth-century grant from Arakan, coastal Burma. There we find, in a quite damaged plate (Sircar 1967: 65), ll. 11–12: *svakāritavihāre ratnattrayopayogāya catuṣpratyayanimittaṁ bhagnasphuṭi*[*ta*] /// *kimmājuvdevyā āgatānāgatajetavanavāsitasthaviracāturddiśāryyabhikṣusaṅgha* ///.

The formula *āgatānāgata-cātuddisa*(*bhikkhu-*)*saṁgha* appears several times in the Pāli Vinaya (ii.147,26,28, 164,22,24), and at least once in the *Jātaka* (i.93,12,14), and specifies that of all those monks belonging to the monastic community in general, the gift in question is made to those who at present reside in the monastery mentioned and those who will in future times reside there. Hirakawa 1964: 353 stated that the formula belongs only to the Pāli Vinaya and, with the exception of the *Jātaka* passage, this may be correct for Pāli sources. But a similar expression is attributed at least once to the Kāśyapīyas in the **Abhiniṣkramaṇasūtra* (T. 190 [III] 861b20–21 [*juan* 45]): *zhāotí xiànzài wèilái yīqiè dàzhòng* 招提現在未來一切大衆. There are, however, considerable complications with the expressions in this text, on which see Tomomatsu 1932: 229–239. See also Silk 2002.

Although the reference to present and future residents of the monastery seems to be what is meant, it might also be possible to understand the sense as "those who have arrived and who have not yet arrived," not referring to future generations but to presently living monks who reside elsewhere. This, however, does not seem to be the meaning of the expression in the inscriptions or in Pāli sources, but see Tomomatsu 1932: 252.

From a legal point of view, the expression is quite interesting, since it specifies that the right of ownership of holdings thus gifted to the monastery resides in its residents, whoever they may be. What this might

Especially since this formulation is unique in known inscriptions, it is very hard to say precisely what is meant here by the expression, or the possible roles or responsibilities of those referred to.

The comparatively rare word *karmāntika*, known from both literature and inscriptions, could conceivably be related to *navakarmika*.[101] In one case from perhaps the second century C.E., the individual in question (called *kama*[*ṁ*]*tika*) is a minister (*amacha*), apparently responsible for the gift of an image, tank, and monastery by a princess.[102] This *karmāntika* is clearly not a monk. In another case, however, from the perhaps fourth-century Devnī Morī casket, the two named *kārmāntika* are explicitly called Śākyabhikṣu, which probably indicates them not only as monks but as Mahāyānists.[103]

As remarked above in passing, with the exception of these inscriptional references to *navakarmika*, inscriptions of all periods seem to only rarely mention what we might judge to be administrative titles, and the more recent inscriptions seem to do so even more rarely than the older. However, the significance of this pattern remains unclear.[104]

---

imply about the legal status of the owner(s) of the monastery is not clear. The implications of this articulation should be explored in future studies, which will have to consider the real legal status of the abstact community of the four quarters. See, to begin with, Hirakawa 1964: 352–366, which is in some sense a very brief summary of Tomomatsu 1932.

101. The word *kammantika* apparently does not occur in canonical Pāli. When it is found in the *Jātaka* commentary, however (e.g., Fausbøll 1877–1896: i.377.17), it seems to refer to a rather humble status. The form *karmāntika* appears in the *Mahāvyutpatti* § 3823, where it is understood as something like field hand or farmer (*zhing pa*).

102. Bühler 1885; Gai 1960; Tsukamoto 1996: 388–389 (Banavāsī 1); Shizutani 1979: pre-Gupta 170; Lüders 1912: §1186.

103. The inscription was first published in Mehta and Chowdhary 1962, but their interpretation is untenable. See later Sankaranarayanan 1965; Mirashi 1965; Mehta and Chowdhary 1966: 121; Srinavasan 1967; Tsukamoto 1996: 394–396 (Devnī Morī 1). Of these, the reading of Srinavasan seems to be the most reliable (and his plates quite readable). Following a statement that a great stūpa was set up by two named monks, the relevant half-verse reads: *kārmmāntikau ca pāśāntika-paḍḍau* [*śā*]*kyabhikṣukāv atra*. This seems to be among the very earliest inscriptions characterized by Schopen 1979: 13 as Mahāyāna (but the date of Devnī Mori is controversial; see Schopen 1979: 19n35).

The form *kārmāntika* is known from the *Arthaśāstra* (Kangle 1969: 1.12.6, 2.4.11, 5.3.7). The first and last passages suggest that this post is one of middle-high ranking, grouped along with the city judge and the like.

104. Among the terms which do appear later is *davvārikā* (= *dauvārika*), "door keeper," found on an inscribed image of the eleventh or twelfth century, where it refers to a lay devotee (Aiyar 1925–1926b; Tsukamoto 1996: 611–612 [Gopālpur (Jabalpur) 1]), but this is not, as far as I know, ever used as an administrative designation in Buddhist contexts. The relevant portion of the inscription reads: [*de*]*yadhamo yam pravara-mahājānujāyi*[*naḥ*] *paramopāsaka-kāyastha-śrī-Subhakta*[*sya*] | *suta śrī-Satka-davvārikā Denuvāyā*. See Schopen 1979: 10 on the association of *pravara-mahāyānuyāyin* with *paramopāsaka*. The term *dauvārika* occurs in the *Arthaśāstra* (1.12.6, 5.3.5, 5.6.5) where it is understood by Kangle as "chief palace usher," a rather important and powerful position. On the other hand, the same word seems to be used quite frequently for a very humble position, rather like a modern doorman (Latin *janitor*). This is the case usually with Pāli *dovārika* (Fick 1920: 155–157), and for example in the *Divyāvadāna* in the *Nagarāvalambikāvadāna* (Cowell and Neil 1886: 82.3 = Dutt

The inscriptional examples of the term *navakarmika* we have discussed allow us to offer several suggestions. First, their very inclusion in such inscriptions suggests the importance of the title. These are not mere laborers. If anything, we should perhaps think of them as "general contractors," wealthy and rather powerful individuals who oversee construction, but do not necessarily ever actually dirty their own hands with physical labor. This fully conforms to the impression we had already gained on the basis of the literary evidence. That the appellation *navakarmika* is applied to individuals who are also called *thera* (that is, *sthavira*), *bhadanta*, *ārya*, and *bhāṇaka* also strongly indicates the high status of this designation. What the exact relation might be between the *navakarmika* depicted in literature and those whose names and deeds are preserved in inscriptions is hard to say. Some connection with construction seems to be obvious, but what broader administrative role these individuals may have had is not quite so clear. Neither is it even hinted at what place such individuals, or this "office," if it may be rightly so called, might have held within the monastic hierarchy. What is more, the relation between the *vaiyāpṛtyakara* and the *navakarmika* has also yet to be clarified. Their proximity in the lists in the *Mahāvyutpatti* and *Ugradattaparipṛçchā* suggested to us some sort of association, but other than to say that both are involved in monastic administration and supervisory functions, and that there are examples of both having fiduciary duties, on the basis of the presently known evidence we would be hard pressed to come up with any concrete conclusions about their connection. And yet, this may be precisely the point. It is quite possible that, rather than overlapping, their duties were complementary. It may be that both were administrators and have little more in common. Nevertheless, as I have stressed, the nature of currently available evidence is such that a certain generalization and leveling in our reconstructions is almost inevitable. This generalization, however, may be nothing more than an artifact introduced by our studies. If so, to turn around and point to this very generality as a result of our inquiry would be to indulge in the worst sort of circularity. For that reason, we must maintain vigilance regarding what our sources themselves suggest to us and what emerges rather from the manner in which we have chosen to array those sources. If the *vaiyāpṛtyakara* and *navakarmika* look so similar, and the

---

1939–1959: iii.i.80,9) where we find both *dauvārika* alone, translated *sgo srungs* (D 1, *'dul ba, kha* 163b1) and *shǒuménrén* 守門人 (T. 1448 [XXIV] 54a6 [*juan* 12]), and *dauvārikapuruṣa* (Cowell and Neil 1886: 81.6–7 = Dutt 1939–1959: iii.i.79,16), translated *sgo srungs kyi mi* (D 1, *'dul ba, kha* 163a4) and again *shǒuménrén* 守門人 (T. 1448 [XXIV] 53c23 [*juan* 12]); see Hiraoka 1996: 72n5 (the story is also translated, without any reference to Hiraoka 1996, in Hakamaya 2001: 302 [5]); on the term generally, see Stein 1948: 84.

Note that this word, *dauvārika*, is derived from *dvāra*, door, and is not related to terms containing the final compound member -*vārika*, a word we will explore in Chapter Five.

nature of their similarity is somewhat unfocused, it would be premature to draw any conclusions at all from this "fact."

Of course, the *vaiyāpṛtyakara* and *navakarmika* are not the only two monastic administrators whose titles are known to us. When it comes to administrative roles, the duties of which seem to be generally more precisely defined, we encounter other sets of vocabulary, one hint of which we have seen above in terms such as *upadhi-vārika*. We will turn to the first set of this terminology now.

This page intentionally left blank

5

Vārika and Specialization of Duties

The word *vārika* occurs frequently in Buddhist literary sources, and less frequently in inscriptions, as the final member of compound terms for administrative roles. I have found it so far only once in non-Buddhist literature, in Kṣemendra's *Narmamālā*, where it has been understood in the general sense of some type of official.[1] The term does occur, however, in some Brahmanical inscriptions, independently and in compounds. In the mid-tenth-century Rāṣṭrakūṭa charters of Kṛṣṇa III from Mahārāṣṭra, for instance, we find the expressions *Śrī-Bhillamāladevo vārikapurassaras* and *devavārikānām*. Sircar has understood the sense here as the god Bhillamāla and his attendant *vārika*s.[2] In an eleventh-century grant to a Nīlakaṇṭha shrine from north central India, we find the expression *śaivāḥ pāśupatācāryavārikapramukhāś*, again understood by Sircar as "Śaivas headed by the Pāśupata *ācāryas* and *vārikas*," taking *vārika* as "temple superintendent."[3] In a rather earlier grant, probably from western India, perhaps near Valabhī, and likely dating to 592, we find *vārika* by itself as well as compounded with other words. Compounds found in this inscription are *peṭavika-vārika* and *kalvapāla-vārika* given in the singular, and *uttarakulika-vārika* in the plural. At one spot, it is

1. The word had earlier been read *dārika*. See the critical edition of Baldissera 2005: 12, 67, with n. 134 (verse I.128).

2. Sircar 1957a, ll. 35, 47 (in 47, in the genitive case), and 42 (*devavārikānām*).

3. Katare 1957, interpreted by the editor Sircar on 164n1.

stated that the *vārika* supervises those engaged in forced labor (*viṣṭi*). Sircar, noting also the form *śānti-vārika* from inscriptions of the Chandra kings of Bengal (understood as "probably a priest in charge of propitiatory ceremonies")[4] and *nāga-vārika* found in lexicons,[5] says that *vārika* "seems to indicate a class of officials." He is willing to connect it with *vāra* in the sense of "the member of a committee."[6] However, there may be some doubt whether it is really to be directly connected with the vocabulary in use in South India to which he alludes, namely, *pañcavāra-vāriyam*. This has been explained by Aiyer as "a committee [*vāriyam*] concerned in the realisation of the revenue in kind due to the king on certain class[es] of lands amounting to five shares [*pañcha-vāra*] out of the six of the entire assessment."[7] I cannot accept the application of this evidence to our word in Buddhist usage, but I defer discussion to an exploration of the etymology of the word *vārika* below.[8]

Although many of these terms are not often found even in Indian Buddhist literature, and almost never in inscriptions, it will be helpful to examine some lists of administrative titles from several Buddhist sources, which appear to catalog assignments and specialized duties. One well-known source of Buddhist monastic administrative titles is a list of twenty "vocations" or administrative responsibilities found in the *Mahāvyutpatti*:[9]

1. vihārôddeśaka[10]	gnas khang bsgo/bsko ba
2. bhaktôddeśaka[11]	zas la bsko ba
3. yavāgū-cāraka	thug pa 'grim/'drim pa
4. khādyaka-cāraka	bag cos/chos 'brim/'grim/'drim pa[12]

4. See Basak 1913–1914b: 139, l. 28, who understands it (p. 142) as "in charge of the holy sacrificial waters," evidently connecting *vārika* with *vāri*. See below n. 8.

5. According to Böhtlingk and Roth 1855–1875: 4.95a, the term means a royal elephant; king of the elephants; peacock; another name for Garuḍa; and superintendent of the assembly, quoting for the last Hemacandra's *Anekārthasaṁgraha* 5.5.6 and *Medinīkośa* 230.

6. Sircar 1957b: 171–178, items 15, 19, 27–29, 31, 47, 72.

7. Aiyer 1937: 23.

8. Schopen 1990/1997: 284n56 refers to several studies on the word *vārika*. Tewari 1982=1987: 208–211 connected the word with *vāri*, water, suggesting it as an abbreviation of *vāri-vāhaka*, "water fetcher." This interpretation has been rightly rejected by Sircar 1987 (and see already Sircar 1966: 364).

9. *Mahāvyutpatti* §§9056–9075. See also the suggested translations given these items in Csoma de Kőrös 1910–1944: 241.

10. In the Mahāsāṁghika Bhikṣuṇī Vinaya (Roth 1970: 287.1, §248, 9B.1), we find the form *vihāroddeśa*.

11. The word *bhatudesaka* appears in a Bhārhut pillar inscription of the second or first century B.C.E.; Lüders 1963: 20 (A17); Tsukamoto 1996: 585 (Bhārhut 127); Lüders 1912: §812; Shizutani 1979: pre-Gupta §235. *Bhattuddesaka* in Vinaya literature has been studied by Konno 2002.

12. The form of this word is problematic. The critical edition of the *Mahāvyutpatti* (Ishihama and Fukuda 1989) cites the Tibetan as follows: *bag* <(?) *cos* PNL/*chos* DC> <*'brim* C/*'grim* DPN/*'drim* L> *pa*. Dictionaries, however, offer different versions of the first form: Zhang 1985: 1806 has the form *bag chal*; Xibei

5.	phala-cāraka	shing tog/thog 'grim/'drim pa
6.	yatkiṃcic-cāraka	phran tshegs 'grim/'drim pa
7.	bhāṇḍa-gopaka	snod spyad 'grub/'drub pa
8.	bhāṇḍa-bhājaka	snod spyad 'ged (= 'gyed) pa
9.	varṣāśāṭī-gopaka	dbyar gyi ras chen sbed pa
10.	cīvara-gopaka	gos sbed pa
11.	cīvara-bhājaka	gos 'gyed/'ged pa
12.	upadhi-vārika	dge skos
13.	preṣaka	mngag gzhug pa
14.	bhājana-vārika	sder spyad kyi zhal ta pa/ba
15.	pānīya-vārika	chu'i zhal ta pa/ba
16.	prāsādi-vārika	mdzes 'chos
17.	pariṣaṇḍa-vārika	bang rim kyi zhal ta pa
18.	śayanāsana-vārika	mal stan gyi zhal ta pa
19.	muṇḍaśayanāsana-vārika	mal stan gyi phyogs kyi zhal ta pa
20.	chaṇḍikā-vārika	sge'u chung bsrung ba[13]

We might offer a tentative translation of these items as follows:

1. assigner of residences/monastic cells
2. assigner of meals
3. distributor of gruel
4. distributor of solid foods (bread?)
5. distributor of fruit
6. distributor of trifles
7. guardian of utensils
8. distributor of utensils
9. guardian of cotton material for the rain retreat
10. guardian of robes
11. distributor of robes
12. supervisor

Minzuxueyuan Minzu Yanjiusuo 1986: 297 has *bag chal brims*; Xibei Minzuxueyuan Zangwenjiaoyan 1979: 577 has *bag chal brims pa*; while Chos kyi grags pa 1981: 554 lists *bag chal brims*, *bag chol*, and *bag chos*. Btsan lha Ngag dbang tshul khrims 1997: 525 defines the term *bag chos* as *khur ba'i zas*, citing a number of Vinaya commentaries in support. I cannot resolve the multiplicity at present, and no doubt, among other things, the etymology of this term requires somewhat more attention than it has hitherto been given. Note that the term *khur ba* is given by *Mahāvyutpatti* §5700 as equivalent to *maṇḍa*; by Jäschke 1881: 42, on the authority of Csoma, as "bread, food"; and by Desgodins 1899: 98 as "pain, miche, crêpe."

13. The word *sge'u chung* here renders the mysterious *chaṇḍika*. In the *Saṁghabhedavastu*, however, the same Tibetan term renders simply *dvāra* (Gnoli 1978b: 71.6 = D 1, *'dul ba, nga* 160a4). See the *Vinayasūtra* auto-commentary in Textual Materials 36. The word *sge'u chung* is defined as *ma grags pa'i lam* in Btsan lha Ngag dbang tshul khrims 1997: 121, and in Desgodins 1899: 242 as "petite porte ou ouverture."

13. messenger (?)
14. manager of dishes
15. manager of (drinking) water
16. manager of beautification (?)
17. manager of (the stūpa's) staircase
18. manager of bedding and seats
19. manager of temporary bedding and seats
20. manager of the side door (?)

This list is very likely based upon that in the *Vinayasūtra* of Guṇaprabha. Since the latter appears in compact sūtra form, it is more convenient for our purposes to extract from it the implied items in their full form, as follows:[14]

1.	vihārôddeśaka	gnas khang bsko ba
2.	bhaktôddeśaka	zas la bsko ba
3.	yavāgū-bhājaka	thug pa 'drim pa
4.	khādya-bhājaka	bag chos 'drim pa
5.	phala-bhājaka	shing tog 'drim pa
6.	avara-mātraka	par bur 'drim pa (cy. adds phran tshegs 'drim pa)
7.	bhāṇḍa-gopaka	snod spyad 'grub pa (*Vinayasūtraṭīkā* spells 'drub)
8.	varṣāśāṭī-bhājaka	dbyar gyi ras chen 'ged pa[15]
9.	kaṭhina-bhājaka	sra brkyang 'ged pa
10.	cīvara-bhājaka	gos dag 'ged pa
11.	upadhi-vārika	dge skos
12.	preṣaka	mngag gzhug pa
13.	bhājana-vārika	sder bcad 'drim pa
14.	pānīya-vārika	chu'i zhal ta pa
15.	prāsādaka-vārika	mdzes chos (*Vinayasūtraṭīkā*: mdzes 'chos pa)
16.	pariṣaṇḍā-vārika[16]	bang rim gyi zhal ta ba
17.	śayanāsana-vārika	gnas mal dbog pa (*Vinayasūtraṭīkā*: 'bog[s])

14. Sankrityayana 1981: 111.21–31 (§17.1.4). The Tibetan is found in D 4117, *'dul ba*, *wu* 93a4–b1. The auto-commentary is found at D 4119, *'dul ba*, *zu* 250b7–252a2. See too the *Vinayasūtraṭīkā* of Dharmamitra, D 4120, *'dul ba*, *yu* 359a3–361b3.

15. The *Vinayasūtraṭīkā* here and for the next two items has both *'g[y]ed* and *sbed*.

16. I am not entirely sure why Karashima 2000a: 57n88 wants to emend to *pariṣaṇḍa-v°*. He refers to Edgerton 1953 s.v., but Edgerton there points out, with examples, that the word appears also in the feminine form *pariṣaṇḍā*.

18.	muṇḍaśayanāsana-vārika	gnas mal byi dor dbog pa[17]
19.	chaṇḍika-vārika	sge'u chung bsrung ba

We find only two items here not mentioned in the *Mahāvyutpatti* list: (6) *avara-mātraka* and (9) *kaṭhina-bhājaka*. The former, however, at least in terms of its literal meaning, is equivalent to the *Mahāvyutpatti*'s item 6, *yatkiṃcic-cāraka*; we note that the *Vinayasūtra* commentary's gloss of *avara-mātraka* as *phran tshegs 'drim pa* is precisely the *Mahāvyutpatti*'s translation of *yatkiṃcic-cāraka*.[18] The second item, *kaṭhina-bhājaka*, distributor of the *kaṭhina* cloth shared out after the rain retreat, has no strict parallel in the *Mahāvyutpatti* list.

The arrangement of Guṇaprabha's text informs us that this list is extracted, in part, from the *Śayanāsanavastu* of the Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya. And there we do find some, but not all, of the same items listed.[19] As we will see below, the listing of administrative roles in twelve items is common in the Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya, although the twelve items themselves are not always precisely the same. I quote these titles from the *Śayanāsanavastu*, together with their Tibetan translations:[20]

1.	vihārôddeśaka	gtsug lag khang (b)sko ba/'g(y)ed pa
2.	bhaktôddeśaka	zas la (b)sko ba (in the *uddāna*: zas 'g[y]ed)
3.	yavāgū-cāraka	thug pa 'brim/'drim pa
4.	khādyaka-bhājaka	bag chos 'brim/'drim pa
5.	yatkiṃcic-cāraka	phran tshegs 'brim/'drim pa
6.	bhāṇḍa-gopaka	snod spyad 'drub pa (*uddāna*: snod spyad sbed pa)
7.	cīvara-gopaka	gos sbed pa
8.	cīvara-bhājaka	gos 'ged pa
9.	varṣāśāṭī-gopaka	dbyar gyi ras chen sbed pa
10.	varṣāśāṭī-bhājaka	dbyar gyi ras chen 'g(y)ed pa
11.	preṣaka	mngag gzhug pa
12.	prāsādi-vārika	mdzes 'chos pa

17. The auto-commentary at D 4119, *'dul ba, zu* 251b5–6 (identical in the *Vinayasūtraṭīkā*, D 4120, *'dul ba, yu* 361a4–5) says: *gnas mal byi bo zhes bya ba ni khri dang khri'u dang | stan nang tshangs can dang mal cha dang stan dang gnas mal la sogs pa med pa 'di lta ste | shing ljon pa'i drung dang ne'u gsing la sogs pa gtan gyi gnas mal ma yin pa'o.* "**Muṇḍaśayanāsana* means: Bedding and mats, and so on, that are without seat, chair, cushion, bedding, wadding, bed clothes, or cushions, that is, what is not a permanent bed or mat made near a tree or in a field and so on."

18. For the form *avara-mātraka*, see Waldschmidt et al. 1973–: 164, and compare Pāli *ora-mattaka* in Trenckner et al. 1924–: II.756.

19. As I have noted above, p. 39, n. 1; Schopen 2001: 103–105 has shown that Guṇaprabha is quite reliant on the *Vinaya Uttaragrantha*, but I have so far failed to locate this list in that particular text.

20. Gnoli 1978a: 55.22–56.1; D 1, *'dul ba, ga* 221b5–222a5; S 1, *'dul ba, ga* 300b4–301a4.

Above, I offered some provisional English translations for these sets of terms. It certainly appears that such lists designate with some specificity the duties associated with each title—at least insofar as one may judge based on an etymological understanding of these titles. And unless we have some example of actual usage of a given title, unfortunately this etymology is all we have. We should note that there also exist a number of parallel lists, some from the same Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya tradition, but since these are not extant in any Indic language, making the identification of some items more than usually problematic, I will defer consideration of these lists until later.

Such lists are not, of course, the sole province of the Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya. A Pāli Vinaya list of various offices parallels the Mūlasarvāstivāda material rather closely:[21]

a. bhattuddesaka	assigner of meals
b. senāsana-paññāpaka	allocator of bedding and seats
c. bhaṇḍāgārika	keeper of the storehouse
d. cīvara-paṭiggāhaka	accepter of robes
e. cīvara-bhājaka	distributor of robes
f. yāgu-bhājaka	distributor of gruel
g. phala-bhājaka (cy.: phalavāra)[22]	distributor of fruit
h. khajjaka-bhājaka	distributor of solid foods
i. appamattaka-vissajjaka	dispenser of trifles
j. sāṭiya-gāhāpaka	receiver of outer cloaks
k. patta-gāhāpaka	receiver of bowls

21. *Cullavagga* VI.21 = Oldenberg 1879–1883: ii.175.37–177.24 (trans. Horner 1938–1966: v.247–249), and in *Aṅguttara-Nikāya* (Morris and Hardy 1885–1900: iii.274.15–275.17). See Matsuda 1983a: 116–119. Compare also *Mahāvagga* VIII.5ff. = Oldenberg 1879–1883: i.283.15ff. in which other terms are used for monks in charge of robe material.

Sukumar Dutt 1924: 154–156 attempted to classify the administrative roles in the monastic community largely on the basis of this Pāli enumeration. His catalog is not entirely consistent, however, since he lists the *kappiyakāraka*, obviously a non-monk, alongside *bhattuddesaka*, equally clearly a monastic office. He also mixes materials from other places in the Pāli canon, such as the *navakammika*, suggesting that this might be an office to which one was appointed temporarily, without however providing any reason for this suggestion. Cf. Satō 1963: 310–327. Vajirañāṇavarorasa 1983: 53–76 is an interesting survey (written in 1921) from the perspective of the then-contemporary Thai saṁgha.

We may recall here the passage noted above in p. 45, n. 30 (Textual Materials 11), in which Buddhaghosa seems to place on an equal footing the clearly nonmonastic *kappiyakāraka* and *veyyāvaccakara* and the clearly monastic *yāgu-*, *phala-*, and *khajjaka-bhājaka*. The matter requires further investigation.

22. In the *Samantapāsādikā*, Takakusu and Nagai 1924–1947: 358.2. Note that not all such forms necessarily have the same syntax. According to Trenckner et al. 1924–: s.v. *udaka-vāra*, this word means "a turn at (drawing, bringing, supplying) water."

l.	ārāmika-pesaka	overseer of monastery attendants
m.	sāmaṇera-pesaka	overseer of novices

Many items in these lists seem to have straightforward meanings, but there remain several points which need to be be addressed. One thing we immediately notice is the array of suffixes available for the formation of such terms, including -*uddeśa*(*ka*), -*cāraka*, -*gopaka*, -*bhājaka*, -*vārika*, -*paññāpaka*, -*paṭiggāhaka*, -*gāhāpaka*, and -*pesaka*. Now, it is more than a little problematic to try and identify equivalences among this diversity of terms. Still, the similar structures of these lists at least allow us to wonder whether some slightly differently titled roles might have been conceived of as being similar in responsibility (diachronically or synchronically). In this regard, let us look at an interesting set of terms:

yavāgū-cāraka	thug pa ’grim/’drim pa	yāgu-bhājaka
khādyaka-cāraka	bag cos/chos ’brim/ ’grim/’drim pa	khajjaka-bhājaka
phala-cāraka	shin tog/thog ’grim/ ’drim/’brim pa	phala-bhājaka
yatkiṃcic-cāraka	phran tshegs ’grim/’drim pa	(avara-mātraka)

The terms in the first line are not particularly difficult to understand, but they introduce us to a problem. We notice instantly that the *Mahāvyutpatti*’s and *Śayanāsanavastu*’s -*cāraka* is paralleled in the *Vinayasūtra* and Pāli Vinaya by -*bhājaka*. The latter is unambiguous and means “distributor.” But what of -*cāraka*? A look at the corresponding Tibetan translation pushes us in the direction of complication, rather than clarification.

Tibetan *’grim pa*, Jäschke tells us,[23] is sometimes used for *’brim pa*, but otherwise has the sense of “to go, walk, march about, perambulate, to rove or stroll idling about.” In other words, this might be an apt translation for a Sanskrit form from √*car*. When we next turn to *’drim pa*, however, Jäschke once again directs us to *’brim pa*, which he defines as “to distribute, deal out, hand round.” (We also note that, at least in modern standard Tibetan, *’brim*, *’grim*, and *’drim* are homophones.) This meaning seems to conform much more reasonably to what we would think the *yavāgū-cāraka* should do, namely, exactly what the *yāgu-bhājaka* should do, which is distribute rice gruel. We also note that, in the lists above, what the *Mahāvyutpatti* has as *khādyaka-cāraka* is written *khādya(ka)-bhājaka* in the *Vinayasūtra*, *Śayanāsanavastu*, and Pāli Vinaya

23. Jäschke 1881 s.v.

(*khajjaka*-). The *Mahāvyutpatti*'s *phala-cāraka* is found in both the *Vinayasūtra* and in Pāli as *phala-bhājaka* and in the Pāli commentary as *phala-vāra*. Other contrasts of interest include the forms *varṣā-gopaka* and -*bhājaka* alongside Pāli *sāṭiya-gāhāpaka*; *cīvara-gopaka* and -*bhājaka* alongside *cīvara-paṭiggāhaka* and -*bhājaka*; *bhāṇḍa-gopaka* alongside *bhaṇḍāgārika*; and *śayanāsana-vārika* alongside *senāsana-paññāpaka* and *śayanāsanoddeśaka*,[24] which we shall discuss in a moment. Now, some of these distinctions may point, for instance, to respective responsibilities to take care of, store, and generally look after something, as opposed to distributing it, making sure it reaches those who need it. But this possible distinction alone does not solve some of the apparent overlap, and this fact itself is of great importance.

Some of the issues raised here have been addressed by Seishi Karashima, who has concluded from a study of the vocabulary in -*cāraka*/-*vārika* and related verbal forms that those in -*vārika*/*vārayati* are the historically correct forms, but that those in -*cāraka*/*cārayati* were employed from a very early date in virtually identical senses.[25] He accepts for the verb *vārayati* the sense "gives, distributes" and connects it possibly with *vara* in the sense of "gift," or √*vṛ* meaning "choose." He suggests that the denominative sense of "have someone select something to their liking" extends to "give," "give to many people," and hence "distribute."[26] When it comes to *vārika*, however, Karashima accepts the meaning of "take responsibility for, manage," connecting it with √*vṛ* in the sense of "ward off, check, restrain."[27] Whether or not this is theoretically possible, I prefer to identify the word *vārika* with *vāra* (which itself, we must remember, also occurs in the same environment) in the sense of one's "turn," the "appointed time" for one to do something (connected, of course, with √*vṛ* in the sense of "choose").[28] I think this understanding may be supported, for

24. Schopen 2002: 364 draws attention to the form *śayanāsana-grāhaka* in the *Varṣāvastu* of the Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya (Dutt 1939–1959: iii.4.133.8).

Konno 2004a has tried to establish a distinction between Pāli *senāsana-paññāpaka* and *senāsana-gāhāpaka*, mostly on the basis of the *Samantapāsādikā*, suggesting that the former is a temporary assignment made from among resident monks, while the latter refers to the monk who is in charge of distributing bedding and seats during the rain retreat, and is therefore not a concurrent post. See also Konno 2004b.

25. Karashima 2000a: 50–59. Part of the evidence for the confusion is found in Chinese translations such as *xíngchóu* 行籌, "to distribute counting sticks," corresponding to *śalākāṁ* √*car*.

26. Karashima 2000a: 56–57. In his examples, he generally translates the term *kubaru* 配る or *ataeru* 与える.

27. Karashima 2000a: 58. Karashima does not refer to previous studies on the word *vārika*, or to its inscriptional occurrences.

28. This suggestion was made already by Karunatillake 1980: 62. Karunatillake understood *vārika* to indicate a committee or group of monks, but aside from the plural context in the inscriptions he has examined, and an appeal to the word *vāriya* in South Indian inscriptions, I cannot follow his arguments here. Unfortunately, he seems to build a rather grand edifice of monastic administrative structure on the basis of his committee theory.

instance, by the occurrence of terms like *māsa-vārika*, one appointed for a month's time, a term we will discuss in a moment. It is also far from unimportant to note that, in many Indic scripts, the *akṣaras ca* and *va* are written almost identically. Thus, a graphic confusion between them is to be expected. In many cases, indeed, it may be quite difficult to distinguish which form is intended, *cāraka* or *vārika*.

If we accept, then, at least the functional equivalence not only of -*cāraka* and -*vārika*, but of both with -*bhājaka*, as suggested by the examples offered above, it should not surprise us to find in the same list in the *Mahāvyutpatti* those items beginning with *upadhi-vārika* and continuing with *bhājana-*, *pānīya-*, *prasādi-*, *pariṣaṇḍa-*, *śayanāsana-*, *muṇḍaśayanāsana-*, and *chaṇḍikā-vārika*. Here, two of the Tibetan translations utilize the term *zhal ta pa* which, as we saw earlier, is by itself (that is, uncompounded) one standard equivalent of *vaiyāpṛtyakara*. Other equivalents use *'drim pa*, *dbog pa*, or *bsrung ba*, or do not employ a paraphrastic construction. These latter instances, *dge skos* and *mdzes 'chos*, may have more easily found Tibetan equivalents, and only for those Sanskrit terms for which concise Tibetan translations were not available were more unwieldy paraphrastic constructions required. Why there was no apparent effort to standardize the renderings, with one set translation for *vārika* in such contexts, is difficult to say. One hypothesis, however, is suggested by the considerable flexibility we saw in the vocabulary studied above. What appears to be a patternless alternation among *cāraka*, *vārika*, *bhājaka*, and so on may hint that the Tibetan translators too were presented with a smorgasbord of fluctuating terminology, from which they too were unable to extract an entirely ordered system, or which they recognized did not represent any such system in the first place. At the present time, in any case, without such a hypothesis, it is impossible to coherently account for the multiplicity and variety in these renderings. One possibility that must be considered, of course, is that the eighth-century and later Tibetan translators were themselves unable to discern precisely the organizational structures lying behind Indian Buddhist texts composed centuries earlier. The distance between theory in texts and practice on the ground, as it were, is already one significant chasm. But when texts of one time and place are transported elsewhere in time and (even cultural) space, the gap widens even further. Under such circumstances, a certain lack of clarity and pristine order is only to be expected. The inability of the Tibetan translators to extract a coherent system, however, if this was indeed the case, simultaneously suggests that their Indian collaborators and informants likewise saw no pattern in the older textual presentations. This in turn suggests the possibility of a significant gap between canonical formulations and the actual

organization of North Indian Buddhist monasticism in the ninth century or so.

This is one set of problems. But there are more. Even when we have some idea of what these job titles were supposed to mean, if only etymologically, it is not always easy to be sure who might have held such a post. As an important example, the word *upadhi-vārika* is quite common in Mūlasarvāstivāda texts such as the Vinaya and *Divyāvadāna*. In the *Nagarāvalambikāvadāna* of the *Divyāvadāna*, when Kāśyapa finds the Jetavana empty, he inquires of the *upadhi-vārika* the whereabouts of the monastic community,[29] while the *Dharmarucy-avadāna* contains a reference to the post being filled by a newly ordained monk. The responsibilities of the post as they appear in this passage consist in taking care of the monastery while the Buddha and the rest of the monks are away.[30] We also recall that in a passage from the *Pūrṇāvadāna* quoted above,[31] the *upadhi-vāra* (obviously equivalent to *upadhi-vārika*) was responsible for sweeping the monastery, and in fact the corresponding Chinese translation rendered the term by "sweeper." In the *Avadānaśataka*, the responsibility for sounding the *gaṇḍī* lies with the *upadhi-vārika*,[32] while in a passage in the *Pārivāsikavastu* of the Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya, the *upadhi-vārika* is responsible for announcing the date every evening.[33] This comes at the end of an enumeration of the tasks of monks on probation (*pārivāsika*) or even those in the (semi-)permanent state intermediate between monk and layman, the *śikṣādattaka* who has gained his status by violation of one of the *pārājika* rules.[34] We will discuss this passage in detail below but, briefly put, these individuals must do such things as wake up early and clean the monastery, set out the seats and the incense, strike the *gaṇḍī*, and so on.[35] It is therefore of great interest to notice in the same sect's *Vinayavibhaṅga* an *upadhi-vārika*

29. Cowell and Neil 1886: 81.27, trans. Hiraoka 1996: 71.

30. *Divyāvadāna*: Cowell and Neil 1886: 237.16, 24. Obviously based on the context rather than on any etymology, Zimmer 1925: 21 rendered the term *upadhi-vārika* with "Torwache." This *avadāna* has no known Tibetan or Chinese version.

I do not understand the meaning of the same word twice in the *Mākandikāvadāna* (Cowell and Neil 1886: 542.21, 543.17). Here, the Tibetan translation seems very different (D 3, *'dul ba, nya* 199b6, 201a3), and even more so the Chinese T. 1442 (XXIII) 893b (*juan* 48).

31. Textual Materials 16.

32. *Avadānaśataka* in Speyer 1906–1909: II.87.2 (story 85: Yaśomitra), translated into French in Feer 1891: 324. In the Tibetan translation (D 343, *mdo sde, aṁ* 230a6; S 252, *mdo sde, sha* 337b4), we find as the equivalent *khang skyong*, usually **vihāra-pāla*. See below p. 144, n. 33. The passage is not in Chinese T. 200 (IV) 246c. For a discussion of the *gaṇḍī* and its role in monastic life, see Hu-von Hinüber 1991.

33. Dutt 1939–1959: iii.98.8–9, studied in Schopen 1998: 158–161.

34. See here the very interesting and important papers by Clarke 1999, 2000, 2007.

35. See below p. 141.

depicted as responsible for arranging the seats, distributing incense in the stūpa-court, and striking the *gaṇḍī* in the morning. The story is worth quoting at length:[36]

> The Buddha, Blessed One, was dwelling in Śrāvastī, in the Jetavana, in the garden of Anāthapiṇḍada. At the time when the Elder Maudgalyāyana gave initiation and ordination to the group of seventeen novice young men, Upāli and others, the seventeen decided that if one of them were to be assigned some role, all of them would perform it. Then at a certain time when an all-night recitation of the teachings was taking place in the monastery, all of them worked diligently to prepare. Later, in the day-time, a steam-room was constructed for the monastic community, and there too all of them worked hard to get it ready. Later that day, one of the seventeen was appointed *upadhi-vārika*, and that day too all of them stayed to decorate the monastery. Then, when the *upadhi-vārika* was working hard, one of the seventeen thought: "I'm so tired, I've got to sleep. Why can't [the other] sixteen men work hard?" Thus thought each of them, and so each of the other sixteen went to sleep. The *upadhi-vārika* alone by himself worked all night long, and at day-break he collected the lamp-bowls, opened the gates, sprinkled down the monastery, gave it an application [of cow dung], announced the time, set out the sitting mats, distributed incense on the circumambulatory platform of the shrine [**caityāṅga*], climbed atop the monastery, and began to ring the gong.
>
> Then, when those sixteen were awakened by the sound of the gong, each of them, picking up his begging bowl, left his cell, and when they saw that single *upadhi-vārika* engaged everywhere at once, they said to each other: "Elders, while he alone was engaged everywhere at once, did any of us help him?" One said: "I thought: 'I'm so tired, I've got to sleep. Why can't [the other] sixteen men work hard?' " Another spoke in the same way, and yet others, and then all of them spoke so. Then the sixteen said: "Elders, if he is the one who went in the first place [to do] everything that we need to do right away, that we did not help him was our fault. Since he will criticize us, as soon as we finish eating we must ask his pardon," and when they finished eating they began to ask his pardon. The younger ones touched his feet, and the older ones hugged him

36. Textual Materials 37, translated from Tibetan. The passage is referred to by Schopen 1998: 159nn7, 11.

around the neck, but when they said: "Elder, forgive us!" he did not say anything at all.

There was one who knew him very well, and he tickled him, and he began to laugh, and said: "I forgive you." The others thought: "This is a good technique!" and someone else tickled him, and then they all tickled him in that way, and he could not catch his breath and he died.[37]

They immediately began to wail, and the monks said: "Hey, why are these seventeen suddenly wailing?" And they said: "Earlier, we were seventeen, but now we are sixteen—we are without our dear fellow-practitioner, and we have committed a *pārājikā* offence." Those monks said: "This is not good," and they left. Those sixteen too went to one side, and sat down contemplating things. Other monks saw them, and those monks scolded them saying: "These seventeen elders are like a fire in straw which blazes up in an instant, and then is extinguished in an instant. One moment they are laughing, the next moment they are sitting down deep in thought." Tormented by the flame of misery, even though they were rebuked they could say nothing, and remained like that.

The monks asked the Blessed One about that situation, and the Blessed One said: "Monks, there is no offence for those monks. Still, monks must not tickle. If one does, he becomes guilty of an offence."

There are several interesting features to this story, with its tragic-comic twists, but for the present we should notice specifically the enumeration of duties expected of the *upadhi-vārika*. These almost precisely overlap those expected of the disgraced monk. Moreover, these seventeen monks are also portrayed as participating in the construction of a steam-room or sauna, which in light of what we have seen above, we might have expected to be the domain of the *navakarmika*.

References to the main responsibilities expected of the *upadhi-vārika* in this story are not rare. In another passage in the Mūlasarvāstivāda *Vinaya-vibhaṅga*, extant only in Tibetan and Chinese, Upananda is an *upadhi-vārika* (translated in Chinese as *zhīsēngshìrén* 知僧事人) who unlocks the gate, puts away the lamps, sprinkles down the monastery, puts out the cushions, distributes incense on the circumambulation platform of the shrine, ascends atop

37. I do not completely understand the expressions here, and my translation is something of a guess: *de rlung gyen du 'chugs te dus la bab bo*, 時彼風氣上衝即便命殞.

the monastery to ring the gong, and surveys the area.[38] Mention of at least the first portion of this formula, the sprinkling, sweeping, and application of cow dung, is quite common and not necessarily the responsibility of one holding any certain administrative title.[39]

All of this hardly gives us the impression that this is a job to be held by one of much seniority or power, a conclusion already hinted at by the *Dharmarucy-avadāna*, whose *upadhi-vārika* is a newly ordained monk, and an impression reinforced by a passage in the *Kṣudrakavastu* in which the *upadhi-vārika* is made responsible for putting covers on sitting mats, cleaning them, and so forth.[40] Schopen has stated, "The *upadhi-vārika* sometimes appears as a monk of some status, and sometimes almost as a janitor."[41] My impression is that, in the vast majority of instances, his status is much closer to the latter.

Other similar designations also seem to be less than exalted. In the *Saṁgharakṣitāvadāna* of the Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya, we find the term *pānaka-vārika*, "distributor of [drinking] water," as a qualification of a novice, *śrāmaṇeraka*,[42] again suggesting the humble status of this particular role. In the *Divyāvadāna* parallel to this passage, in which the syntax is a bit different, the equivalent is read as *pānavāram uddiṣṭa*.[43] In addition to instancing the noun *pāna-vāra*, this also reminds us of forms with *-uddeśa(ka)*, such as *bhaktoddeśa(ka)* which, in light of the variety of designations we have just seen, should also not surprise us.[44]

38. D 3, *'dul ba, ca* 103b4–5, 104b5–6 = T. 1442 (XXIII) 652a4, b7–9 (*juan* 6).

39. Mūlasarvāstivāda examples include (but certainly are not limited to) *Pravrajyāvastu* (Vogel and Wille 1996: 257.8–9 [trans. 279] = Dutt 1939–1959: iv.39.10–11; Tibetan in Eimer 1983: II.279.10–11; also see Eimer 1983: II.167.14–15, in Chinese at T. 1444 [XXIII] 1030c8–9 [*juan* 2]); *Varṣāvastu* (D 1, *'dul ba, ka* 238a2; in Chinese at T. 1445 [XXIII] 1041b11); *Carmavastu* (Dutt 1939–1959: iv.195.5–6; in Tibetan in D 1, *'dul ba, ka* 268b6; in Chinese in T. 1447 [XXIII] 1054a4–5 [*juan xia*]); *Pravāraṇāvastu* (Chung 1998: 152 [§5.1.1]; in Tibetan on p. 190, Chinese p. 266); and repeatedly in the *Poṣadhavastu* (Hu-von Hinüber 1994: 370 [§69.1.a], 382 [§76.1], 480–484 [§94.1–5]).

40. Schopen 1996: 117, referring to S 6, *'dul ba, ta* 242a1–243a2, and D 6, *'dul ba, tha* 159b3–160a6.

41. Schopen 1996: 97n35.

42. Vogel and Wille 1996: 264.12–13. The same is quoted in the *Śikṣāsamuccaya* (MS 34a4; Bendall 1897–1902: 58.1), but the key word is omitted there. Yijing's Chinese translation of the *Pravrajyāvastu* (T. 1444 [XXIII] 1037b5) seems to take the word as meaning one who distributes honey syrup in the community: 求寂爲行蜜漿於僧伽中. Since it is hard to imagine Chinese *mìjiāng* 蜜漿 as a translation or interpretation of *pāna*°, perhaps another term was found in Yijing's Sanskrit original. (Or perhaps *pānaka-vārika* is taken to mean one in charge of drinks in general, and *mìjiāng* signifies some sort of honey drink?)

43. Cowell and Neil 1886: 343.1. As Karashima 2000a: 58 points out, in the *Abhisamācārika* (Biku Igihō Kenkyūkai 1999: 224.25, 222.3), we find the form *pānīya-vārika*.

44. Sasaki 1993 has drawn attention to the fact that the term so well known in Zen circles, *diǎnzuò* 典座 (Japanese *tenzo*), is at least once apparently equivalent to *upadhi-vārika*. He refers to the *Kṣudrakavastu*, T. 1451 (XXIV) 295b16 (*juan* 16), the equivalent of which in Tibetan is found in D 6, *'dul ba, tha* 257b6, as *dge skos kyi dge slong*. However, he omits to mention that immediately before this in Chinese, in line 1,

There are a number of other terms formed with the *-vārika/-vāra* suffix. The *Śayanāsanavastu* paralleled in the *Saṁghabhedavastu*, for instance, refers to a *latā-vārika*, a "whip master," a foreman of workers who, though magically created (*nirmita*), is addressed as *āyuṣman*, a form of address restricted to monks.[45] As another example, immediately after the *Saṁgharakṣitāvadāna*'s mention of the *pānaka-vāraka*, it also refers to a *mudra-vāra*,[46] read probably more correctly by the *Śikṣāsamuccaya* quotation of the passage as *mudrā-vāra*.[47] The individual made responsible (*niyukta*) for this *mudrā-vāra* is also a *śrāmaṇeraka*, but an arhat as well. He is verbally assaulted by a monk who is responsible for looking after the begging bowls (*pātrakarma pratyupasthita*). It is interesting that we have seen virtually the same pattern in a *Pūrṇāvadāna* episode quoted above.

How to understand the term *mudrā-vāra* is not entirely clear. As Bendall points out, the Tibetan translation of the *Śikṣāsamuccaya* has here *dam bzhag pa'i las*,[48] which appears to mean "the work of a manager." The Tibetan translation of the Vinaya text itself has *dam bzhag par bskos pa*, "one appointed as manager."[49] Vogel and Wille rendered the Sanskrit "charged with keeping the seal,"[50] and Bendall and Rouse "appointed to take his turn at the stamp,"[51] evidently taking *vāra* as "turn." *Mudrā* of course means "seal," one Tibetan equivalent of which is *dam kha*, although *phyag rgya* is the common translation. But at least one Tibetan dictionary, on the basis of a Vinaya commentary, takes *dam bzhag pa* as "manager."[52] Yijing's Chinese translation of the Vinaya

---

zhīshìrén 知事人 ("administrator") stands where we find in Tibetan (257a4) the same *dge skos*. This I think only emphasizes what I have already suggested, namely, that either Yijing is a very careless translator, his orignal differed, or his penchant for elegant variation leads him to what we may interpret as significant inconsistency. (I am, of course, aware both that we cannot determine the readings that Yijing had before him in his Sanskrit source and that Yijing was not able to revise his own translations, but with regard to the latter point, I have some doubt whether their poor textual history and transmission can account for all of the variability in his renderings.)

45. See Gnoli 1978a: 23.8–9, 15, 17=1978b: i.176.17–18, 24, 26, trans. Schopen 2000b: 122, and 180nnX.3, X.7.

46. Vogel and Wille 1996: 264.19–20. The *Divyāvadāna* lacks any equivalent.

47. Bendall 1897–1902: 58.6=MS 34a7.

48. Bendall 1897–1902: 58n4; Tibetan at D 3940, *dbu ma, khi* 38a2.

49. Eimer 1983: II.297.9–10.

50. Vogel and Wille 1996: 292.

51. Bendall and Rouse 1922: 59.

52. Btsan lha Ngag dbang tshul khrims 1997: 319, referring to the *Dam pa'i chos 'dul ba'i sde snod kyi ming don brda dkrol 'dul gzhung rgya mtshor 'jug pa'i gru gzings* of Blo bzang Dam chos rgya mtsho, with the following definition: *dam bzhag pa | gnyer pa'i ming ste "'dul ba'i sde snod kyi ming don brda dkrol" las | dam bzhag pa ni gnyer pa lta bu'o || zhes gsungs pa ltar ro* ||. The same definition is found in Zhang 1985: 1249a, which takes *dam bzhag pa* as archaic for *gnyer pa*, manager.

Tshe ring dbang rgyal (Bacot 1930: 77/78b) gives *daṁ bzhag* as *samādi*, which I cannot understand.

text[53] has *zhuānzhī sēngqié kùzàng* 專知僧伽庫藏, which should also mean something like "devoted to the administration of the saṁgha's stores." Finally, in reference to this passage, the *Vinayavastuṭīkā* of *Kalyāṇamitra says:[54] " 'Manager' is one [assigned duties] for a fortnight, the **karmadāna*;[55] the sense is 'seal-holder [*phyag rgya pa*].' " This presents some very valuable information. First, it specifies that this is a temporary assignment, which as I will argue is a characteristic of *-vāra*/*-vārika* titles. Second, this commentary explicitly connects the managerial role with the seal, forging a link between the two notions.

I am afraid this collection of sources has the potential to become an excellent example of a perilous practice, namely, the confrontation of a Sanskrit word we do not understand with Tibetan and Chinese translations we likewise do not understand, this trilingual list then being presented as if it constituted some sort of conclusion or solution. However, it may not be too speculative and imaginative to suggest that *mudrā-vāra* refers, as suggested by Yijing's interpretive rendering, to an officer who is in charge of administering the stores. In such a capacity, he would naturally be the holder of the seal, whose imprint was essential for the transaction of monastic business. This would imply that both the Tibetan and Chinese translations have offered interpretive and nonliteral renderings of the crucial term which, as far as I know, is a *hapax legomenon*. Why such an apparently responsible position might be undertaken by a *śrāmaṇeraka* remains unclear.[56]

Although the term *mudrā-vāra* as such has yet to be found elsewhere, the use of monastic seals and their employment as signs of office is of course quite well known, as we noticed above in our consideration of some *navakarmika* sealings. We may also note that some Brahmanical inscriptions from eleventh- to twelfth-century Bengal have the word *mahāmudrādhikr̥ta*.[57] This has been understood to mean "keeper of the royal seal," upon what grounds I do not know.[58] A further claim likewise seems quite possible, but also stands unproven:[59] "Every

53. T. 1444 (XXIII) 1037b10 (*juan* 4).

54. D 4113, *'dul ba, tsu* 302b4–5: *dam zhag pa zhes bya ba ni zla ba phyed cing las su bskos pa ste phyag rgya pa zhes bya ba'i tha tshig go* ||.

55. This understanding of *las su bsko pa* is speculative. I will discuss the term in detail below.

56. Shayne Clarke suggests in a private communication the possibility that, being unbound by restrictions of the monastic code, as a non-monk the novice's freedom to act would be broader than that of a monk, while at the same time he could devote himself to the monastic community.

57. The word occurs in virtually identical stock phrases a number of times: Banerji 1917–1918: 160, l. 32; Banerji 1925: 283, l. 26; Banerji 1913–1914: 9 (from Dinajpur, now northwestern Bangladesh), l. 27; Basak 1913–1914a: 40, l. 31.

58. Basak 1913–1914a: 42–43.

59. Sen 1942: 568.

copper-plate grant was to be stamped with the Royal Seal, which must have been in the keeping of the *Mahāmudrādhikṛta*." On the other hand, Kauṭilīya's *Arthaśāstra* uses the word *mudrādhyakṣa* in the sense of "superintendent of passports," referring to a quite different meaning of *mudrā*.[60]

Finally, one possible hint toward understanding the responsibilities of the "keeper of the seal" comes from a discussion of the procedures through which permanent endowments (*akṣayanīvi*) are made and the principal of such endowments loaned out to generate interest income. Exactly like modern endowments, it is the interest from such gifts that is used to fulfill the stated purpose of the gift. Therefore, the gift is permanent, since the principal is never distributed. One of the requirements of the process of making such an interest-bearing loan is the application to the written contract of a seal, *mudrā*. At least according to one source, the contract is signed by the *saṁgha-sthavira* (senior-most monk in the community) and the *upadhi-vārika*, but it is possible to speculate that the necessary seal may have been in the keeping of our *mudrā-vāra*.[61] Further studies on the term in question, and the uses of seals and sealings in Buddhist monasteries, will help to clarify the issue.

Another example of an otherwise unknown word formed with *-vārika* comes from the *Varṣāvastu* of the Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya:[62]

> The monks alloted all the monastic cells. The visiting monks were disappointed. The Blessed One said: "For the sake of visiting monks, an unassigned site must be reserved." The monks assigned [the visitors to a place] in the gate-room. The Blessed One said: "They must not be assigned to the gate-room." [The monks] assigned them to terraces, and the Blessed One said: "They must not be assigned to terraces." Crows, sparrows, and pigeons build their nests in empty residential quarters. The Blessed One said: "A monk must be appointed to drive out [the birds]. He must investigate. If the eggs are not abandoned, he shall drive out [the birds]. If they are abandoned, [the site] should be reserved." Tryambuka and trailāṭa[63]

60. Kangle 1969: §2.34.1, trans. Kangle 1963: 209.

61. See Schopen 1994a, especially 537–540.

62. Textual Materials 38. The Sanskrit text is, in a number of places, impossible for me to construe. Therefore, while paying close attention to the Sanskrit, my translation is based on the Tibetan instead. The Chinese translation differs quite a bit from the Sanskrit and Tibetan texts, and requires a separate treatment.

63. See Mhy. §§4861–4862, and the *Poṣadhavastu* (Hu-von Hinüber 1994: 272 [§9.7]). The Tibetan translations in the Mhy. are *sbrang bu trai la ṭa*, and *sbrang bu tryam bu ka*. For the *Poṣadhavastu*, in Tibetan we find (D 1, *'dul ba, ka* 133b3; S 1, *'dul ba, ka* 198b4): *sbrang bu tre* [S *trya*] *ma bu ka dang* | [S ø] *tre la ta dag*.

flies build their nests [there too]. The Blessed One said: "He must investigate. If the eggs are not abandoned, he shall drive out [the flies]. If they are abandoned, they shall be bound with cords, and the [flies] will not increase in number." After that the bedding and seats shall be given out. If there are few supplies, they should be given out one by one. But if they are abundant, they should be given out in twos and threes. Some areas being very large, the older monks became fatigued while cleaning them. The Blessed One said: "They should be given [residences] in places which have already been prepared."

The expression which I have translated here "a monk must be appointed to drive out [the birds]" renders the Tibetan translation's *skrod pa'i dge slong dag*, something like "expelling monks."[64] The Sanskrit text, however, seems to read here *menuvāriko bhikṣu*, the meaning of which is entirely obscure to me. The Chinese translation has here *yīnglìng yī bìchú zhī sēngqié lìyǎng* 應令一苾芻知僧伽利養, "should cause one monk to manage the saṁgha's goods(?)," which does surely suggest some sort of administrative assignment, but is otherwise considerably at odds with the sense of the Tibetan translation. In any case, it is hard to understand *skrod pa'i dge slong* as a translation of **menuvāriko bhikṣu*—although, to be sure, since I have absolutely no idea what the latter might mean (or how the reading might be emended), this statement may, after all, be next to meaningless.

Other terms in *-vārika*/*-cārika* appear in the *Abhisamācārika* of the Mahāsāṁghika (Lokottaravāda) Vinaya. There, we find reference to *māsa-cārika* and *pakṣa-cārika* as those who are responsible for keeping track of the date.[65] It is virtually certain that these terms signify a temporary assignment for, respectively, a month and a fortnight. The corresponding Chinese translation, which here as elsewhere in this text is much more terse than its Indic counterpart, has *zhíyuè zhīshìrén* 直月知事人, "the administrator appointed for the/a month."[66] (It is natural to assume, given the concern exhibited elsewhere with keeping track of the date, that such assignments ran

64. S has *sprod* for D's *skrod* (P *skod*), for which I cannot account.

65. Biku Igihō Kenkyūkai 1998: 48.23–24 (MS 3b3). See Prasad 1984: 35. The same words are found at 51.21 (4b3) and 58.2 (6b2). For Indic *māsacāriko vā pakṣacāriko*, T. 1425 (XXII) 500a14 (*juan* 34) surprisingly has 直月、若園民、若沙彌, that is, "**māsa-cārika*—either **ārāmika* or **śrāmaṇera*." I do not understand this, other than to offer the obvious suggestion that here the *māsa-cārika* is understood not to be a monk, but rather a layman or novice.

66. T. 1425 (XXII) 499c23 (*juan* 34). The passage is translated by Lévi and Chavannes 1915: 203–204, in turn referred to by Schopen 1998: 175n61, who however does not note the Indic text.

for *the* month or fortnight, rather than lasting for twenty-eight or fourteen days from some arbitrary starting point, but this is not made clear anywhere, as far as I know.) A bit later in the same text, along with *māsa-vārika* and *pakṣa-vārika*, we also encounter the terms *daśāha-vārika* and *paṁcāha-vārika*, which we may then understand as one appointed for ten and five days, respectively, that is, one whose turn lasts for ten or five days.[67] (These appointments we might assume not to have necessarily corresponded to any particular calendrical cycles.) Here, the reference is to those responsible for food preparation, presentation, clean up and the care of utensils. The structure of these temporary assignments suggests that these titles are either to be understood generically, as "[administrator] assigned for a month," and so on, or as a parallel category to titles we find elsewhere without specification of any length of apppointment, but which we also know to be temporary. In other words, these titles, such as *māsa-vārika*, do not seem to designate some administrative role typologically different from those mentioned elsewhere with titles which make no use either of indications of duration of time or of the word -*vārika*. That these individuals here are monks is at the very least suggested by the fact that they are to summon the *kalpiyakāra*, the layman responsible for legalizing donations to monks.[68] The corresponding Chinese translation is both interesting and problematic. It contains the following sentences:[69] "Either the *mómódì* or the **māsa-vārika* should have an **ārāmika* and/or **śrāmaṇera* put things in order. A *mómódì* or **māsa-vārika* who is not attentive should have a **kalpiyakāra* put things in order." Here again, the clear implication must be that these individuals, the *mómódì* and the *māsa-vārika*, are monks. What the former term means is a great problem, with which we will grapple below.

We note some of the same -*vārika* vocabulary in the *Sphuṭārthā Śrīghanācārasaṁgrahaṭīkā* of Jayarakṣita, also probably to be identified as a Mahāsāṁghika work.[70] The relevant passage reads:[71]

67. Biku Igihō Kenkyūkai 1999: 205–204 (30–31) (MS 38a3–b2). See Prasad 1984: 172–174. Note that if it has been read correctly, this manuscript itself alternates between -*cārika* and -*vārika*. A facsimile of the manuscript was published, but I have not been able to see a copy.

68. See Edgerton 1953 s.v. *śabdāpayati*. Here, however, the sense may be rather simply "summon," rather than "cause to summon."

69. T. 1425 (XXII) 509b17–18 (*juan* 35): 若摩摩帝若直月當使園民若沙彌摒擋。若摩摩帝若直月不用意見者、便應使淨人摒擋. See Lévi and Chavannes 1915: 204–205.

70. The coincidence of views with other Mahāsāṁghika passages, including those just quoted, lends support to Shimoda's 1987 hypothesis that Jayarakṣita's text belongs to a Mahāsāṁghika tradition.

71. Textual Materials 39. My translation is indebted to those in Singh 1983: 170, and Derrett 1983: 43; and to the remarks of Shimoda 1987: 939. It is probably good to note here again that the Sanskrit text cannot necessarily be regarded as critically edited.

> Someone, thinking that as long as worship of the sage, Buddha, Blessed One, takes place, worshipful reverence of the community is also continuing,[72] may, with the intention of theft, give possessions belonging to the community to the stūpa, or possessions belonging to the stūpa to the community. He [thereby] becomes one whose vows are broken, that is, he becomes a non-ascetic. [To the possible objection:] Is it not so that whatever wealth there is all comes to belong to the Blessed One, and that with correct mental concentration the intention of theft does not arise? [We answer:] No. For this very distinction excites the intention of theft, just as happens with someone who is stealing water with a compassionate intention. Where is theft established in this case? On the other hand, is it permitted to take a share for the stūpa from the stores belonging to the community? No. [The root text says:] "Having written it down" and so on. [This means] the share must be taken from the stores belonging to the community only after the administrators for the week,[73] the administrators for the half month, or the administrators for the month [*sa*(*pta*)-*vārika*, *pakṣa-vārika*, *māsa-vārika*] have recorded it in writing. "Mutually" [in the verse] means reciprocally. The share for the community must be taken from the stūpa, and the share for the stūpa from the community [reciprocally]. And those administrators [*vārika*] must say, when the transaction has been completed, "So-and-so much money, gold and so on, has been taken from the stores belonging to the stūpa, and so-and-so much from those belonging to the community." Otherwise [the administrator] is one who does not do what was stated. What are the other possibilities? If they take the share without having recorded it in writing, and do not so state at the end of the month, they become those who do not do what was stated . . . They incur a *duṣkṛta* offence.

A passage such as this does not, certainly, imply that all administrative roles denoted by titles in -*vārika* concern fiduciary responsibilities, but the conclusion that the suffix -*vārika* specifies a temporary assignment is easier to draw. It is quite possible to speculate that such temporary administrators, responsible here for fiscal matters, were called in different places, at different

72. This idea may be identified with a doctrinal stance of the Mahīśāsaka sect; see Silk 2002.

73. Note that this usage implies knowledge of the seven-day week, a concept introduced into India by the Greeks. The topic of the transfer of such scientific ideas requires further research. It is worth noting here that Indian Buddhist embryological texts which calculate pregnancy and its stages in terms of seven-day weeks also rely for this notion on ideas introduced from the West.

times, or in different communities by different titles. If this is so, we might further suppose that those with similar responsibilities, even though called by different titles, were also appointed temporarily. Below, we will consider what evidence there might be for this hypothesis.

As an additional literary reference to *-vārika* terminology, we may note the Ceylonese *Samantapāsādikā*'s use of the word *vihāra-vārika/-cārika*, sometimes in parallel with *yāgu-bhatta*.[74] The subcommentary *Sāratthadīpanī* understands the former as one who takes his turn (*vāra*) guarding the monastery.[75] This is in complete concord with the hypothesis that *-vāra/-vārika* is indeed to be traced to *vāra* in the sense of "choice" or "turn," although of course the lateness of the text, which dates from the twelfth century, and its Ceylonese provenance render its evidence secondary and inconclusive.

We do have, additionally, some inscriptional evidence for terms in *-vārika*, although not nearly as much as we saw for the term *navakarmika*. A number of sealings from medieval Nālandā mention *vārika* monks. One sealing has been read *Śrī-Nālandā-catur-bhagavat-*[*ā*]*sanavārika-bhikṣūṇā*[*ṁ*],[76] and another *Śrī-Nālandāya Śrī-Bālāditya-gandhakuḍī-vārika-bhikṣū*[*ṇāṁ*].[77] Although the sense of *āsana-vārika* seems clear, referring no doubt to the monks responsible for bedding, in literary sources the preferred form seems to be *śayanāsana-vārika*, as we have seen above. We may suppose that the monks referred to in the second sealing are in some way responsible for the *gandhakuṭī*, but what this might have entailed we do not know precisely. Parallels suggest that, at the very least, such an individual was responsible for cleaning the shrine.[78] An inscrip-

74. Takakusu and Nagai 1924–1947: 357.2, 9, 11, 14, 18, 21. Also 6.1263.

75. I cite the edition of the Vipassana Research Society (Igatpuri, India, 1998): vol. 97, 2.134 (this edition reproduces the Burmese Sixth Council edition): *vihāravāre niyutto vihāravāriko vāraṁ katvā vihārarakkhaṇako*. See Gunawardana 1979: 122. The text is attributed to Sāriputta, a twelfth-century author, according to von Hinüber 1996: 172–173 (§§373–374).

76. Sastri 1942: 38 (S. I, 919), with the editor's correction in n. 3.

77. Sastri 1942: 38 (S. I, 675), with the editor's correction in n. 4. See too p. 43 (S. I, 730), which Karunatillake 1980: 62 is certainly right to read *Śrī-Nā Dharmapāladeva-gandhakuṭī-vārika-bhikṣūṇā*[*ṁ*].

It is to be noted, as Karunatillake points out (1980: 62), that the occurrences of the term *samavārika-bhikṣu* in several sealings is puzzling (if the reading is correct—but no plates are published). Sastri 1942: 39 (S. I, 938): *Śrī-Nālandā-catu*[*rddiśaka-Samavāri*]*ka-bhikṣusaṅghasya*; (S. 9, R. 91): *Śrī-Nālandā-satraka-samavārika-bhikṣūnāṃ*.

Note also the sealing at Sastri 1942: 37 (S. I, 1005): *Śrī-Nālandā-cakrāre vārikabhikṣūṇāṁ*. I do not know how to understand *cakrāre*, and plate IId is not clear to me. One suggestion is to parse the word as *cakra-ara*, spoke of a wheel, but just what this might mean in context I do not know. The only example of such a word I have found is as the name of a Rākṣasa king in the *Paumacariyam* (Chandra 1970: 216), but I doubt this is of any relevance whatsoever, and instead wonder whether we should emend to *cakrār*[*ām*]*e*. The *cakrārāma* is a type of monastery structure or plan, detailed in the *Vāstuvidyāśāstra* (Marasinghe 1989: 78–83).

78. Schopen 1990/1997: 268–269 in reference to the word *gandhakuṭī-vārika* says, "[W]e have a reasonably good idea of what this might have meant from a series of similarly constructed monastic titles, all of

tion from Andhra dating from perhaps the fourth century seems to refer to the erection of a vihāra by the *bhadanta* Saṁghadeva, who is a *gandhakuṭī-vārika*.[79] And a Kāṇherī inscription of perhaps the fifth century mentions a monk (*śākyabhikṣu*, and thus probably a Mahāyānist) who is a *mahāgandhakuṭī-vārika*.[80]

Given what we can establish about this vocabulary, the way in which several words in the *Divyāvadāna*, apparently *hapax legomena*, have been treated seems to require reconsideration. In the *Pūrṇāvadāna*, we come across an episode in which the Buddha is going to travel to Sūrpāraka, accompanied by some of his retinue. The king waits for him to arrive:[81]

> By means of magic power the *patra-cārika*-s, *harita-cārika*-s, and *bhājana-cārika*-s came. Seeing them, the king said: "Reverend Pūrṇa, has the Blessed One come?" The venerable Pūrṇa said: "Great king, these are the *patra-cārika*-s, *harita-cārika*-s, and *bhājana-cārika*-s. The Blessed One has not yet [come]."

Concerning the terms *patra*-, *harita*-, and *bhājana-cārika* (or -*vārika*), Edgerton noted this passage and explained:[82]

> [I]t seems clear that the reference is to persons who magically *ride* or *move* thru the air on *leaves*, some sort of *plants* or *trees* and *jars*. . . There is a v.l. -vārika, which [Böhtlingk 1879–1889: 7.365]

which have -*vārika* as the final element." Mentioning the terms *bhājana-vārika*, *pānīya-vārika*, and *upadhi-vārika*, he goes on to say:

> Titles ending in -*vārika* would appear, then, to have been used to designate the monk or monks who were officially in charge of important administrative and material areas or aspects of a functioning monastery. To judge by this title, a *gandhakuṭī-vārika* must have been a similar official, a monk or the monk "in charge of the Perfume Chamber."

However, this does not yet clarify the exact meaning of the terms. See also Schopen 1990/1997: 284–285n60.

79. Sastry 1984. The inscription has not been well edited, but a number of corrections are suggested by the journal's editor in the notes. Possessing only a photocopy of the article itself, I do not know the name of this editor or whether any plates accompanied the article.

80. Bühler in Burgess 1883b: 77; Tsukamoto 1996: 419; Lüders 1912: §989; Shizutani 1979: Gupta §72. See Schopen 1990/1997: 269, 283–284n49. It seems to me somewhat more likely that we should understand *mahā*° with *gandhakuṭī* rather than with *vārika*, but I confess I cannot offer any good argument. (Schopen 1990/1997: 269 also takes it this way.)

81. Cowell and Neil 1886: 45.17–21: *yāvat patracārikā r̥ddhyā haritacārikā bhājanacārikāś cāgatāḥ* | *tān dr̥ṣṭvā rājā kathayati* | *bhadanta pūrṇa kiṃ bhagavān āgatah* | *āyuṣmān pūrṇaḥ kathayati* | *mahārāja patracārikā haritacārikā bhājanacārikāś caite na tāvat bhagavān* |. Tibetan parallel in D 1, *'dul ba, ka* 310b3–4: *ji tsam na lo ma 'drim pa dang* | *shang tse 'drim pa dang sod spyad 'drim pa dag rdzu 'phrul gyis lhags pa rgyal pos mthong nas smras pa* | *ci btsun pa gang po bcom ldan 'das gshegs sam des smras pa* | *'di dag ni lo ma 'drim pa dang* | *shang tse 'drim pa dang* | *snod spyad 'drim pa lags te* | *bcom ldan 'das ma lags so* ||.

82. Edgerton 1953 s.v. -*cārika*.

> adopts for bhājana-cārika, identifying it with °vārika in [*Mahāvyutpatti*] 9069, which however means something like *superintendent of vessels* and cannot be intended in the Divy[āvadāna] passage.

Agrawala found himself unable to agree with Edgerton:[83]

> Edgerton gives a long note, but the real meaning of *patracārika, haritacārika, bhājanacārika* is not understood. The real meaning is that *cārika* denoted persons who formed part of a procession holding various auspicious objects in their hands or who moved on the back of auspicious animals or in chariots or appeared seated in *vimānas*, all of them moving at the head of the procession in an order. They were followed by the main party. . . . We have actually seen that in some procession of rich persons pots of real flowering plants, fruit-laden branches, vegetables, auspicious leaves and boughs, are carried on the heads of young boys and women; but mostly they are made of clay and paper. At present this is known as *bāgvārī*, i.e., "garden" which term, of course, included the flower-garden, fruit-garden, and vegetable-garden—here referred to as *patracārika*, and *haritacārika*. The *bhājanacārika* were the bearers of *pūtṇaghaṭa* with overflowing leaves, lotuses and flowers or pots with sprouting barley which appear extremely attractive.

Despite this very evocative explanation, there is little evidence to support Agrawala's suggestions. More recently, Seishi Karashima has also studied the *Divyāvadāna* passage, in the context of a wider study of terms in *-cāraka/cārika/-vārika*. Yet, despite noting that both the Chinese and Tibetan versions of the parallel text in the Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya understand the words to refer to monastic offices or roles with the corresponding forms *lo ma 'drim pa*, *shang tse 'drim pa*, and *snod spyad 'drim pa*, and *zhī qí càishì* 知其菜事, *zhī qí shícǎo* 知其食草, and *zhī qí qìwù* 知其器物,[84] respectively, in the end he follows Edgerton's interpretation. Karashima explains:[85]

> However, I do not believe that any terms for administration such as the Tibetan or Chinese translations' "distributor of leaves"/"person responsible for leaves," or "distributor of grass"/"person responsible for vegetables," existed. Even if they did, I do not believe they could

83. Agrawala 1966: 71–72.

84. Karashima's general discussion of the terms *cārika/vārika* in their nominal and verbal forms is found at 2000a: 50–59.

85. Karashima 2000a: 59.

> have carried out those tasks at the places they were invited for meals. And in the *Divyāvadāna*, these terms occur in the plural; it would be strange for there to be several people with the same administrative task. Therefore I agree with Edgerton's interpretation.

Although there is nothing which would lead us to follow Agrawala's explanation, there are also good reasons for disagreeing with Karashima and Edgerton here. In the first place, as a general rule, we probably do not know enough about administration in Indian Buddhist monasteries to make any categorical claims such as those offered by Karashima. But with regard to the last point, at least, we have explicit evidence disproving Karashima's suggestion. For example, we have seen that in the *Śayanāsanavastu*, the term *śayanāsanoddesika bhikṣu* appears in the plural, and in a story from the *Vinayavibhaṅga*, quoted above, it is implied that a group of seventeen monks simultaneously undertook the tasks of the *upadhi-vārika*. It is also likely that there were many cooks or servers or sweepers (of which at least the last is explicitly stated to be one of the tasks of the *upadhi-vārika*) in one monastery at the same time—how much the more so if the monastery were anything other than an extremely small one. This offers strong evidence against Karashima's sense of strangeness that several people are responsible for the same administrative task. (It still remains possible to imagine that if the titles in question refer to those who administer those who cook, clean, and so on, one individual might suffice. But the evidence for this is far from conclusive.)

Another reason to doubt Karashima's claim rests in our own necessary sense of humility. Certainly, both Chinese and Tibetan translators sometimes misunderstood their Indic source texts, and sometimes apparently chose to translate them somewhat less literally than we ourselves as philologists might. Or these translators may present authentic Indian understandings which, nevertheless, belong to periods centuries after the composition of the texts in question. Still, as is overwhelmingly obvious in almost all cases, these scholars knew radically more about all aspects of ancient Indian Buddhism, including its administrative structures, than any of us do today. While they are not perfect, we will frequently go wrong if we reject their evidence without compelling reason. In the present case of the *Divyāvadāna*'s vocabulary, although I cannot cite other examples of these particular words, and the Chinese terms, for instance, seem to appear only here in Yijing's Vinaya translations, it would nevertheless be rash to dismiss the possibility, or even the likelihood, that they are indeed administrative titles. In fact, Yijing's Chinese text is both more interesting and more explicit than

Karashima may imply by his mere quotation of the passage, without translation, in a note.[86]

The Chinese parallel to the *Divyāvadāna* passage in question, from Yijing's translation of the *Bhaiṣajyavastu* of the Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya, refers to five—not three, as in the Sanskrit and Tibetan—"functionaries" who, with their magical powers, precede the Buddha into town:[87]

> The Buddha ordered them to pick five administrators [*shòushì* 授事] who, by means of magical power, would precede him into the neighborhood/palace. Which are the five?
>
> 1. the one in charge of vegetables;[88]
> 2. the one in charge of utensils;
> 3. the one in charge of edible herbs[?];
> 4. the one in charge of clean water;[89] and
> 5. the one in charge of cooking meals.
>
> The king saw these five men coming from the sky, and asked Pūrṇa "Is this the Blessed One?" Pūrṇa responded: "These are the five administrators, come to do temporary service [*jiǎnjiào*], namely being in charge of vegetables and so on—up to—cooking meals. The Blessed One has not arrived yet."

That Yijing, at least, understood the reference to be to administrative roles is made very clear by his use of the term *jiǎnjiào* 撿挍, which as we have noticed above is a technical term of Chinese bureaucracy meaning one who has a temporary appointment to a specific position ("acting magistrate" and so on), indicating the rotating nature of the assignment. The expression in the *Divyāvadāna* stating that these individuals arrive through the air refers to their magical powers, not to the mode of their transportation on vehicles made of leaves and so forth, as Edgerton imagined. And again, given the clear evidence in other cases of multiple administrators, that multiple individuals might hold these posts should also not be reason to doubt the interpretation. We are doubtless much safer following the indications of the Tibetan and Chinese translations here and taking them as our starting points for future investigations of this vocabulary, rather than offering speculative guesses based on the

86. Karashima 2000a: 59n96.
87. Textual Materials 40.
88. Or main courses, the food other than rice?
89. Making sure the water is potable?

etymological roots of a term, guesses, moreover, which ignore the clear patterns of compound formation evident in similar usages.

We may conclude from our examination of this vocabulary, then, that titles in *-cāraka/-vārika* very likely indicate temporary administrative or managerial assignments. The flexibility with which such compounds are formed also suggests a certain overlap with titles designated with the suffix *-bhājaka*, for example, as well as several others. Of course, we cannot forget the warning with which we began this study, namely, that the fundamental fact that we draw our evidence from diverse textual corpora means that in the act of collecting evidence we are also conflating it. The multiplicity we see in our diverse sources may indicate less some actual flexibility of vocabulary on the ground in some specific time and place than suggest that similar, but not identical, words were in use in different communities, both those nearby and those widely separated in time and place. The sources at our disposal do not allow us to overcome this limitation, which also must have been a stumbling block for Indian readers, as texts spread beyond the region of their composition and were handed down through the generations. This said, if we are justified in assuming any sort of coherence and unity in the titles we are studying, we may nevertheless draw several conclusions.

The status of individuals fit to hold such titles is not clear, nor is the status that the title might confer upon its holder. This seems to contrast with what we learned of the title *navakarmika*, which apparently indicates an honorable rank or status within the community, if not the society at large. The postulated temporary or rotating nature of such assignments certainly does allow us to draw one tentative conclusion, however. Such titles, if only temporary, cannot therefore indicate any vocational status. Rather, they must have the nature of an occasional responsibility, rather than a permanent or even long-term specialization. This in its turn suggests, although less forcefully, that the qualifications for such tasks did not necessarily include highly technical knowledge. We might wonder, then, if this is true, whether the ability to write might have been widespread enough for any monk appointed as supervisor for a week, fortnight, or month to naturally have been expected to possess this skill, as is suggested at least by one of the Mahāsāṁghika Vinaya passages quoted above. Or it may simply be that there were various pools of potential labor from which such temporary assignments might have been made, some monks being fit for assignment to tasks which required a knowledge of writing or bookkeeping, others to those of a less skilled or specialized nature; anyone, we might suspect, could be a sweeper. Once again, further studies may clarify these questions.

Although we have made some progress in our investigations of the administrative vocabulary of Indian Buddhist monasticism, a number of terms of great interest remain still to be explored. We will turn to a study of one of these now.

6

*Karmadāna

The Sanskrit term *karmadāna* is known to the *Mahāvyutpatti*,[1] translated there with *las su bsko pa*, but otherwise seems to be extremely rare.[2] We find, however, the same Tibetan equivalent, *las su bsko pa*, in Guṇaprabha's *Vinayasūtra* and commentary, rendering the Sanskrit *karmādāna*.[3] It is possible that this is the correct or a variant form. Since the Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya is the text which Guṇaprabha is summarizing, and upon which he is commenting, one might reasonably expect to find the term *karmă̄dāna* therein, but no certain case has yet been identified.

1. Mhy. §9362.

2. Edgerton 1953 does not enter the term, which seems to be unknown to Pāli and Prakrit, according to the dictionaries at my disposal. It is not in Böhtlingk and Roth 1855–1875, and Schmidt 1928: 137c cites it only from the *Mahāvyutpatti*. Of Tibetan-Sanskrit glossaries available to me, only Bstan 'dzin rnam rgyal 1976: 331b3 seems to enter it: *lasu bsko ba=karmādānaṁ*.

Tomomatsu 1931: 278–279 discussed the term *sēngzhíshì* 僧執事, which he rendered, in an otherwise interesting and valuable discussion, with "saṁghakarmadāna." I do not know on what basis he might have offered this form; I have not seen it attested. Tomomatsu's note is to his translation of the **Mahāprajñāpāramitopadeśa*, T. 1509 (XXV) 224a27 (*juan* 22); the same passage was translated by Lamotte 1944–1980: 1394, who offers, without any reference to Tomomatsu's study (although it was published in *Journal Asiatique*), *vaiyāvr̥tyakara* as a "reconstruction" of the same Chinese. Although neither Sanskrit term can be certainly connected with the Chinese, Lamotte's is less unlikely.

3. As elsewhere, however, this translation is not necessarily consistent. For example, the Tibetan (D 4117, *'dul ba, wu* 31a2–3) *zhe sdang bar gyur pa de rang gis las su bsko bar mi bya'o* renders the Sanskrit (Sankrityayana 1981: 39.13 [§2.4.13.34]) *na svayam enaṁ dveṣyaḥ karmaṇi yuñjīta*. It is my impression that *las su bsko ba/pa* appears more commonly as a verb than as a noun.

One sūtra in the *Vinayasūtra* reads *kartr̥tvaṁ karmādānasya*,[4] but it is without commentary.[5] Given the context and the preceding sūtra, which says, "[the probationer receives his] robes from the *upadhyāya*,"[6] this may mean something like "[the responsibility for assigning the probationer] tasks belongs to the *karmādāna*." The several other passages in which the term *karmādāna* appears, however, seem to require a different sense of the word. I confess that I do not understand these passages well, and for the moment content myself with citing them without translation.[7]

In addition, in a passage from the *Sphuṭārthā Śrīghanācārasaṁgrahaṭīkā* of Jayarakṣita quoted earlier,[8] *karmādāna* seems to mean something like "transaction," while in the *Śayanāsanavastu* of the Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya the sense, in reference to refugee monks (*bhaṅgibhagnaka*), may be something like "full eligibility to take part in monastic actions."[9] This is all very confusing, a situation which we might hope would be, but in fact is not, clarified by the ample Chinese evidence.

Chinese sources do provide, first of all, some evidence for the term's date. Commenting on a passage in the Sarvāstivāda Vinaya containing the putative Chinese translation of *karmadāna*, *weínà* 維那 (also later found as *dūweínà* 都維那),[10] which we will study below, Daoxuan 道宣 (596–667) in

4. Sankrityayana 1981: 3.26–27 (§1.2.109); Bapat and Gokhale 1982: 20.7 (§1.110). The Tibetan translation (D 4117, *'dul ba*, *wu*, 4a2) reads *las su bsko ba'i byed pa po nyid do* ||.

5. See D 4119, *'dul ba*, *zhu* 19b7.

6. *Upādhyāyāt cīvaram*.

7. See Textual Materials 41, 42, 43. The last of these passages very likely refers to a text similar to that in the *Bhikṣuṇī-karmavācanā* edited by Schmidt 1993: 255 (folio 17b–18a), but I do not find any reference to **karmadāna* in the parallel passage in D 6, *'dul ba*, *da* 110–111.

8. Textual Materials 39, cited above, p. 118–119.

9. Gnoli 1978a: 34.22–23: *bhikṣavaḥ tān karmādānaṁ kārayanti* | *bhagavān āha* | *na te karmādānaṁ kārayitavyāḥ iti*. D 1, *'dul ba*, *ga* 210a6; S 1, *'dul ba*, *ga* 284b2–3: *dge slong rnams kyis de rnams las su sko bar byed nas* [S ||] *bcom ldan 'das kyis bka' stsal pa* | *de rnams las su bsko bar mi bya'o* ||. I owe this reference to Gregory Schopen.

10. The word, dictionaries tell us, is pronounced *weínà*, and in Japanese normally *ina*. But Welch 1967: 471n43 notes that it was consistently pronounced by his informants and those of other scholars *wei-no* (or *wei-lo*, accounting for dialectal differences). In this regard, we note the alternative Japanese readings *ino* and *inō*, which might well reflect this pronounciation. See Nakamura 1981: 43b–c, and Oda 1917: 1858c. At least in modern Zen circles, *ino* is the standard pronounciation. Note that in several late fifth- to early sixth-century inscriptions, *weínà* is consistently written 唯那 (Abe 2002: 211, plate 4.33; 221, plate 4.41; 232, plate 4.52—in which the *weínà* are women—but also written 維那 on 241, plate 4.60). Phonetically, 維 and 唯 are identical.

A Chinese reference to the procedure for appointing various administrators, in which the example of the *weínà* is set side by side with other well-known administrative designations, is not relevant for us here because the text in question is a Chinese composition, as Hirakawa 1970: 116 has shown. See Textual Materials 44.

Likewise, although we might expect some parallelism between the institutional structures of the male and female monastic systems, I have not found any clear evidence for female *weínà* in India. Again, a reference in a text on *śrāmaṇerikā* (T. 1475 [XXIV] 939b) is not relevant because this text too has been shown (by Ōno 1954: 395, and Hirakawa 1970: 284) to be a Chinese composition.

his massive Vinaya commentary *Sifenlü shanfan buque xingshi chao* 四分律刪繁補闕行事鈔 says:[11] "*Weínà*: Grammarians render it as sequence [*cìdì* 次第], that is, the sequence of managing/supervising affairs." This passage is repeated in later lexical works as well.[12] As Gernet has quite interestingly pointed out, this explanation assumes a form not in *karma*- but in **krama*-.[13] What is most important here is that this understanding makes absolutely clear that the word was known to Daoxuan in some Indic form, and not just in Chinese translation. It also stands as excellent evidence for the equivalence of *weínà* with the Indic *karmadāna*. Slightly later, the existence of the word is confirmed again by Yijing 義淨 (635–713). He explained the word *karmadāna* in a note in his *Nanhai jigui neifa zhuan* 南海寄歸内法傳, his account of his sojourn in India and a guide to his understanding of proper monastic behavior, as follows:[14]

> [The translation] *shòushì* 授事 represents the Sanskrit *karmadāna*. *Dāna* is "give" [*shòu* 授], and *karma* is "actions" [*shì* 事]. The intention conveyed is of one who gives multifarious actions to others. Archaically [the term was] given as *weínà* 維那, which is not [correct]. *Weí* 維 in the Tang dialect conveys the intention of regulation [lit. binding with a large rope], and *nà* 那 is the Sanskrit sound, [the word being formed by] abbreviating with the omission of *karmadā*°.

The etymology being offered here, of course, is *karma* + *dāna*, "giving actions," which seems perfectly reasonable as a description of an administrator, that is, one who delegates. In another text, his account of monks who went to India in search of the Buddhist teachings, *Datang xiyu qiufa gaoseng zhuan* 大唐西域求法高僧傳, the same Yijing gives some interesting information on monastic administration, including references to the *karmadāna*:[15]

11. T. 1804 (XL) 6b28 (*juan shang* 1): 維那。聲論翻爲次第也。謂知事之次第.

12. It appears, for instance, in the twelfth-century *Fanyi mingyi ji* 翻譯名義集 T. 2131 (LIV) 1075a5–6 (*juan* 1), which attributes the observation to Daoxuan (Nanshan 南山), and therefore avowedly is derivative.

13. On this and other etymologies, see Gernet 1967: 306b–307a. Gernet suggests that this is based upon metathesis of *r*, but it might also be possible to look to some Middle Indic **kamadana* as a source, with the proviso that this would almost certainly not have been Gāndhārī, since *r* as a second member of clusters is characteristically retained in Gāndhārī (see Salomon 2000: 89).

14. Textual Materials 45, trans. Takakusu 1896: 148–149. See also as above in n. 12 the *Fanyi mingyi ji* 翻譯名義集 T. 2131 (LIV) 1075a5–13 (*juan* 1). Yijing's understanding, by the way, would argue against the reading *karmādāna*.

15. Textual Materials 46, trans. Chavannes 1894: 88–89. I cannot agree at all with the rendering given the passage by Lahiri 1986: 54.

> Inside the monastery the eldest *sthavira* is simply[16] appointed chief, without discussion of his merits. Those who have the locks for the gates attach a seal each evening, and then hand [the seal] over to the *sthavira*. Alternatively, without distinction they may place it with the *vihārasvāmin* or *karmadāna*.[17] Only the person who constructed the monastery is called *sìzhǔ* 寺主—*vihārasvāmin* in Sanskrit. Those who have guard duty, control the monastery gates, and announce the business to the community meeting are called *vihāra-pāla*, translated as *hùsì* 護寺. One who sounds the *gaṇḍī* [gong or chime—here probably to summon the monks to meals] and supervises the meals is called *karmadāna*, translated as *shòushì* 授事, and called *weínà* 維那 for short.[18]

The role of the *weínà* as announcer of meetings and meals and sounder of the *gaṇḍī* is confirmed by the use of the term in the Chinese translation of the *Aśokāvadāna*. However, in the one place in which we can correlate this term in the Chinese version with the Sanskrit text preserved in the *Divyāvadāna*, the Sanskrit term is quite different, namely, *udghoṣaka*, "crier, announcer."[19] While this certainly cannot be used as evidence that *weínà* was used to translate *udghoṣaka*, which is extremely unlikely, this correspondence does deprive us of the opportunity to confirm a correspondence of *weínà* with some more-likely Indic form.

References to *weínà* in Chinese translations considerably pre-date Yijing. The Sarvāstivāda Vinaya, translated into Chinese in the opening years of the fifth century, contains a passage which specifies the duties expected of a *weínà* and lists as his qualifications the standard set of five attitudes we will examine in detail below. The text reads:[20]

> The Buddha was dwelling in Śrāvastī. At that time, in the monastery of the Jeta grove there was no monk who knew the demarcations of

16. Here *dàn* 但 perhaps means "automatically."

17. Chavannes 1894: 88 rendered: "ils ne sauraient en aucune façon les déposer chez les maitres du temple [*vihârasvâmin*] ou les directeurs [*karmadâna*]."

18. Takakusu 1896: 148n1, with reference to Chavannes 1894: 89, says, "The word, Wei-na, is insufficient." I do not think this is the sense of *luè* 略, although clearly Yijing did not much approve of the expression. What Chavannes actually translated was "ceux qui les appellent wei-na ne parlent que par à peu près," that is, "those who call them *weínà* are only speaking by way of approximation."

19. *Divyāvadāna* (Cowell and Neil 1886: 403.5 = Mukhopadhyaya 1963: 100.12, trans. Strong 1983: 264) = T. 2042 (L) 105c9 (*juan* 2), trans. Przyluski 1923: 266. In T. 2043 (L) 140c6 (*juan* 3), trans. Li 1993: 46, however, the text has only "monk" (*bǐqiū* 比丘). For other instances of *weínà* in these texts, see Przyluski's indices s.v. *weina* and *karmadāna*.

20. Textual Materials 47.

time or [could] announce the time; no one to strike the *gaṇḍī*; no one to sweep and sprinkle down the road, take care of the lecture hall and eating area; no one to lay out the bedding according to the order [of seniority]; no one to inform which fruits and vegetables were permissible [to eat]; no one to look out for insects in the vinegar;[21] no one to pass out the drinking water at meal times; and no one to snap their fingers [for quiet] when the assembly is disturbed by random chattering.

[The monks] informed the Buddha of this fact, and the Buddha said: "You should appoint a *weínà*. The method of appointing [a *weínà*] is: A monk of settled and centered mind should ask: 'Who is able to act as *weínà* for the monastic community?' If there is a monk who says 'I am able,' if he has five qualities you should not appoint him as *weínà*. Which five? [He acts] according to lust, or according to hatred, or according to fear, or according to delusion, or he does not know what is permissible and what is not permissible. If he successfully achieves five qualities, he should be appointed as *weínà*. Which five? He does not act according to lust, nor according to hatred, nor according to fear, nor according to delusion, and he knows what is permissible and what is not permissible."

Just at that time one monk in the monastic community announced: "Venerables of the monastic community, listen! This monk so-and-so is able to act as *weínà*. If the monastic community finds that the time is right, let the monastic community agree and authorize that the monastic community shall appoint the monk so-and-so as *weínà*. This is the motion, and thus the ecclesiastical action of motion and proclamation [is to be carried out]. The monastic community's appointment of the monk so-and-so as *weínà* is complete." Because they agreed and consented by their silence, this matter is thus settled.[22]

21. Such vinegar would have been used for drinking (see T. 1435 [XXIII] 396b1 [*juan* 53], for example). The Dharmaguptaka Vinaya (T. 1428 [XXII] 677c8 [*juan* 16]) explicitly mentions vinegar (with the same translation, *kǔjiǔ* 苦酒) as included in the general prohibition in its discussion of Pātyantikā 62, the Prātimokṣa rule prohibiting the consumption of water containing insects. (On this rule, see Hirakawa 1995: 13–23.) We notice also that the Mahāsāṁghika Vinaya (T. 1425 [XXII] 345a27 [*juan* 15]) prohibits the use of, among other things, vinegar containing insects to sprinkle over grass or bare ground in its illustration of Pātyantikā 20; so too the Dharmaguptaka Vinaya (T. 1428 [XXII] 646c21 [*juan* 12]). On this rule, see Hirakawa 1994: 254–262.

22. This paragraph consists of stock phrases and terms characteristic of Vinaya legal procedures. These include *sacet saṁghasya prāptakālaṁ kṣametānujānīyāt saṁgho yat saṁgha*. . . *eṣā jñaptiḥ*. . .*jñaptidvitīyakarma*. . . *kṣāntam anujñātaṁ saṁghena yasmāt tūṣṇīm evam etad dhārayāmi*.

> The monk acting as *weínà* should manage the demarcations of time and the announcement of the time; manage the striking of the *gaṇḍī*; manage the sweeping and sprinkling down of the road; take care of the lecture hall and eating area; manage the laying out of the bedding according to order [of seniority]; manage the notification of which fruits and vegetables are permissible [to eat]; manage the examination for insects in the vinegar; manage the passing out of the drinking water at meal times; and snap his fingers [for quiet] when the assembly is disturbed by random chattering.

This passage provides us with a catalog of duties expected by the Sarvāstivāda Vinaya of the *weínà*, tasks that overlap significantly with the duties we saw earlier that were expected of the *upadhi-vārika* in particular, and with those of other named administrators as well. We will return to this point below.

The Mahīśāsaka Vinaya informs us that when some householders, having donated robes, requested benedictions (**anumodana*, *zhùyuàn* 呪願) from the monks, who did not know them, the Buddha directed them to send the *weínà* to offer the benedictions.[23] This might best be understood in the context of the catalog of "ritual obligations" that Schopen has brought to our attention, according to which monks have many ritual obligations to householders (and to fellow monks).[24] Another hint at the scope of the *weínà*'s duties comes from the Mahāsāṁghika Vinaya, which has a monk arrive at a monastery and ask the **āvāsika* (resident), "Who is the *weínà*? Who is the **śayanāsana-vārika* (*zhīchuángrùrén* 知床褥人)?"[25] If we can expect any coherence with the duties sketched in the Sarvāstivāda Vinaya passage just cited, it may also be the case here that the *weínà* is expected to distribute the bedding, while the **śayanāsana-vārika* only assigns the lodging, but does not take care of the housekeeping chores, such as making the assigned monastic cell ready for its occupant. If this is a valid way to read the passage, the newly arrived monk wants to know who the two individuals are whose services he requires in the first place to obtain a place to sleep and something to sleep on. An additional implication, if this understanding is correct, might be that while the **śayanāsana-vārika* is an administrator with supervisory responsibilities, giving the orders as it were, the *weínà* is on the receiving end of those orders. Such a distinction remains, however, speculative.

23. T. 1421 (XXII) 137c23–24 (*juan* 20).
24. Schopen 1992b.
25. T. 1425 (XXII) 304a21–22 (*juan* 9).

A portion of the Sarvāstivāda Vinaya passage just cited is itself quoted in Daoxuan's *Sifenlü shanfan buque xingshi chao*,[26] after which Daoxuan adds the passage we partially quoted above. The reference reads more fully: "Regarding *weínà*: Grammarians render it as 'sequence,' that is, the sequence of managing/supervising affairs. Traditionally one calls him *yuèzhòng* 悅衆" Somewhat later, Daoxuan appeals to a now-lost work of the early sixth-century emperor and enthusiastic Buddhist author Liang Wudi 梁武帝 (Xiao Yan 蕭衍), the *Chuyao lüyi* 出要律儀, with reference to the same *weínà* as follows:[27] "The *Chuyao lüyi* translates it as *sìhù* 寺護, and again calls it *yuèzhòng*." The first clause here seems to suggest **vihāra-pāla* (*sìhù* 寺護) as an equivalent of *weínà*, along with *yuèzhòng*. Both of these equivalences are extremely hard to explain, but the first at least is found elsewhere in an extant early source. In the *Fanfan yu* 翻梵語, which probably itself dates to the early sixth century,[28] we find, in reference to the occurrence of the term *weínà* in the *Da zhidu lun* 大智度論, the explanation:[29] "*Weínà* should be *vihāra-pāla*. Translating it, we say *vihāra* is 'temple,' and *pāla* is 'to protect.'" There is no mention here of *karmadāna*. (We will turn our attention to the word *vihāra-pāla* itself in a moment.)[30] How this use of *yuèzhòng* is to be connected with the role of an administrator, if it really is, has not hitherto been clarified, despite some efforts.

T. H. Barrett has offered some speculations on the history of the term *yuèzhòng* 悅衆, claimed by some sources, as we have seen, to be a translation of *karmadāna*.[31] He suggested that the first equation of *yuèzhòng* with *karmadāna* is that of the Song historian Zanning 贊寧 (919–1001) in his *Dasong sengshi lüe* 大宋僧史略. This may be so,[32] if Barrett means that Zanning was

26. T. 1804 (XL) 6b25–28 (*juan shang* 1), quoting b19–24: 維那。 聲論飜爲次第也。謂知事之次第。相傳云悅衆也.

27. T. 1804 (XL) 135b1–2 (*juan xia* 3): 出要律儀飜爲寺護。又云悅衆。.

28. According to the hypothesis of Ono Genmyō 小野玄妙, the text dates to between the Southern Qi 南齊 and the Sui 隋, placing it probably in the Liang 梁. Ono follows an indication in the *Shittan Mokuroku* 悉曇目録 of Enryakuji Shingen 延暦寺眞源 that attributes the text to the Liang monk Baochang 寶唱, and has it brought to Japan by Ennin 圓仁 in the ninth century. See Ono 1931, and the summary by Tsujimori Yōshū 辻森要修 in Ono 1932–1935: 10.213b–214a. The relevant reference is in Bussho Kankōkai 1914: 187b. Cf. Chen 2004: §1465.

29. T. 2130 (LIV) 1003b10 (*juan* 3): 維那。應毘訶羅波羅。譯曰毘訶邏者寺。波羅者護也。. The passage being referred to is T. 1509 (XXV) 141c22 (*juan* 11), trans. Lamotte 1944–1980: II.674.

30. With reference to the term *yuèzhòng*, strangely, elsewhere in Daoxuan's work we also find the sentence: "*Mānatva* means 'gladdening the mind of the community [*yuèzhòngyì* 悅衆意].' Conforming to the monastic community's teaching, all cherish joy." T. 1804 (XL) 47c9–10 (*juan zhong* 1): 摩那埵者悅衆意。隨順僧教咸懷歡喜. The term *mānatva* here refers to a kind of penance, and the explanation relating it to joy is in fact etymological: see Mhy. §8652, *mānatva* = *mgu bar bya ba*, to gladden.

31. Barrett 1996.

32. T. 2126 (LIV) 242b28–29 (*juan zhong*): 案西域知事僧總曰羯磨陀那。譯爲知事、亦曰悅衆。謂知其事悅其衆也. The text goes on to refer to Dravya Mallaputra. However, note that Zanning here also suggests *zhīshì* 知事 as a translation equivalent of the transliterated *karmadāna*.

the first to place together the term *yuèzhòng* 悦衆 with the transcription *jiémótuónà* 羯磨陀那 (LMC kiat-mua-tfia-naˋ, *karmadāna), although we have just observed that already in the sixth or seventh century *yuèzhòng* had been connected with *weínà* by Daoxuan. However, Barrett goes on to offer some speculations on the meaning or etymology of the word *yuèzhòng*, connecting it with *rāja*, the king who satisfies the people (relating the latter, unhistorically, to √*rañj*).[33] This suggestion is much more problematic. I think more relevant hints are to be found in text passages discussing administrators. For instance, in a passage from the Mahāsāṁghika Vinaya,[34] Dravya Mallaputra, the administrator, thinks: "When I attain the stage of no more learning (*aśaikṣa), I shall administer the affairs of the saṅgha and make [other monks] feel happy." And in the *Ratnarāśi*, as we saw earlier in this study, the following suggestion is offered:[35] "Kāśyapa, the administrative monk should please the minds of all the monks of the community." Rather than explore possible connections with kingship, for which as Barrett himself confesses there is little evidence, it seems more reasonable to suggest a connection of the term *yuèzhòng* with passages such as these. Of course, Barrett is still quite correct that the term *yuèzhòng* cannot very well be understood to "translate" *karmadāna*, a connection or equivalence found in Chinese sources which still resists explanation.

It is difficult to know if the term *weínà* in Chinese translations of Indian texts necessarily always reflects an Indic *karmadāna*, and at least the examples quoted above suggesting a possible equivalence with *vihāra-pāla* might hint otherwise. The problem is only complicated by the history of the latter word in China, where it appears, for example, along with *shàngzuò* 上座 and *sìzhǔ* 寺主 as one of three offices, called *sāngāng* 三綱,[36] a term which occurs already in the sixth-century *Weishu* 魏書 of Wei Shou 魏收,[37] and some centuries later in Zanning's *Dasong sengshi lüe*.[38] While the identification of *shàngzuò* 上座 and

33. See Hara 1969 on epic pseudo-etymologies of *rājan*.

34. T. 1425 (XXII) 341a13 (*juan* 14),: 若我得無學者、當營理僧事、使得安樂. Trans. Karashima 2000b: 239.

35. ¶2. In Sanskrit in the *Śikṣāsamuccaya* (MS 32b5=Bendall 1897–1902: 55.8), we read: *tatra vaiyāpṛtyakareṇa bhikṣuṇā sarvvabhikṣusaṁghasya cittam abhirādhayitavyaṁ*. Tibetan has *'od srung de la dge slong zhal ta byed pas dge slong gi dge 'dun thams cad kyi sems mgu bar bya'o* ||, and the Chinese translation of the sūtra has 營事比丘善取如是諸人心相, while the *Śikṣāsamuccaya* translation has 營事比丘於諸比丘衆應護持是心. The meaning is essentially the same in all of these sources.

36. See Oda 1917: 606c–607a; Mochizuki 1932–1936: 1503b–1504c. The situation of monks holding relevant titles is examined in a Tang context by Forte 2005: 171–179.

37. Hurvitz 1956: 85, §103. Note that according to De Groot 1894: 108–109, already in the period between 532 and 535 during the reign of the emperor Xiaowu 孝武, one of his generals, Hui Chen 恵臻, is given the title *dūweínà* 都維那 and mentioned as carrying a sword. Although he states that this is recorded in the *Weishu*, De Groot refers only to chapter 29 of the Qing work *Rizhi lü* 日知録.

38. T. 2126 (LIV) 244c17 (*juan zhong*). See 244c17–245a25 for a long discussion of these three offices.

sìzhǔ 寺主 with, respectively, **sthavira* and **vihārasvāmin* is usually, but not always, straightforward, since these terms are well attested in Indian sources in Sanskrit, this is not the case, as we have seen, with *karmadāna*. We find an example of some of the possible confusion in, once again, Zanning's *Dasong sengshi lüe*, in which we seem to see *sìzhǔ* 寺主 identified not with *vihārasvāmin*, but rather with the mysterious term *mómódì* 摩摩諦, which we will discuss later.[39]

Before we turn to the mystery of *mómódì*, however, let us see what we can make of the term *vihāra-pāla*, which is somewhat more problematic than it might at first appear.

39. At T. 2126 (LIV) 244c18–19 (*juan zhong*), we find 梵語摩摩諦。悉替那。羯磨那陀 [misprint? should be 陀那]。華言言。寺主上座悅衆也. That is, *mómódì* 摩摩諦 = *sìzhǔ* 寺主 (= ?), *xītìnà* 悉替那 = *shàngzuò* 上座 (**sthavira*), and *jiémótuónà* 羯磨陀那 = *yuèzhòng* 悅衆 (**karmadāna*).

This page intentionally left blank

7

Vihārapāla

So far as I have been able to determine, the word *vihāra-pāla* is not actually attested in Sanskrit, although there are several very good indications that it must have existed.[1] Indirect but persuasive evidence for the identification of the word comes from the Mūlasarvāstivāda *Vinayakārikā*, extant in Tibetan and Chinese. In his translation, Yijing twice uses the term *píhēluóbōluó* 毘訶羅波羅 (LMC pɦji-xa-la-pua-la), an obvious transcription of *vihāra-pāla*. The Tibetan equivalent to this is once *gtsug lag khang skyong*, and once *khang skyong*, the metrical form of the text determining that the full form cannot always be used.[2] As we saw in the passage quoted earlier in regard to the *karmadāna*, in Yijing's *Nanhai jigui neifa zhuan* the same transcription *píhēluóbōluó* 毘訶羅波羅 is given as equivalent to the translation *sìhù* 寺護,[3] a strict rendering of *vihāra-pāla* (*sì*=*vihāra*, *hù*=*pāla*). There, as we saw, it is said that "those who have guard duty, control the monastery gates, and announce the business to the community meeting are called *vihārapāla*." Immediately after this passage, the text goes on to specify that it is the responsibility of

1. On the question of *vihāra-pāla*, see Matsuda 1982b, although his conclusions cannot necessarily be accepted.

2. T. 1459 (XXIV) 649c17 (*juan xia*) = D 4123, *'dul ba, shu* 51a4; T. 1459 (XXIV) 633c13 (*juan zhong*) = D 4123, *'dul ba, shu* 27a3. The feminine counterpart of the word, *khang skyong ma*, also exists: S 5, *'dul ba, nya* 398b2; D 5, *'dul ba, ta* 297b6 (= T. 1443 [XXIII] 1010c19 [*juan* 19] *shǒufáng zhī rén* 守房之人).

3. T. 2066 (LI) 5c25–26 (*juan shang*).

the *vihāra-pāla* to bring the community to consensus when there is a matter to be decided. He makes the rounds, stopping before each person individually, and each joins his palms together and expresses his opinion. Consent must be unanimous, and Yijing explicitly states that beating with a switch must never be employed before the assembly to force the hold-out to consent.[4] Less detailed is the mention in the *Vinayavastuṭīkā* of *Kalyāṇamitra, which says:[5]

> In order to gather [the monks] for the meal, the two gongs, the *gaṇḍī* and the little *gaṇḍī*, are struck. First, striking the little *gaṇḍī* the **vihāra-pāla*, the one in charge of food distribution[6] and others worship the Buddha, wash the bowls, and then after that, when noon-time comes, ringing the great *gaṇḍī* the entire community gathers for the meal.

Although the word *vihāra-pāla* has not so far been located in any Sanskrit source as such, it is found in both Gāndhārī and Pāli. The Niya documents from Central Asia yield two forms, *viharavala* and *vyarivala*[7] As Burrow notes, however, in these documents the word "appears to be a proper name."[8] There is one exception, a document which states:[9]

> The elders Śilaprabha and Puṁñaṣena [are to be] in charge of the monastery [*viharavala*]. They have to administer all the activities of the community. [Disputes] are to be examined in accordance with the law. All the activities of the community of monks are to be administered by them [. . .] so that the community of monks shall be content in mind.

While this certainly appears to employ the word *vihārapāla* in a technical sense, the administration expected of the two elders (here, *vṛdha*) is simply expressed as *saṁgakarani*. Although this demonstrates the existence of the term in Gāndhārī Prakrit, it does not allow us to specify its meaning.

4. T. 2066 (LI) 5c27–6a2 (*juan shang*) = Wang 1988: 113–114, trans. Chavannes 1894: 89–90. See Dutt 1962: 313–314, 338.

5. Textual Materials 48.

6. Btsan lha Ngag dbang tshul khrims 1997: 693b, citing several sources, defines the term *gtsang sbyor* as *zas kyi zhal ta ba*.

7. Boyer, Rapson, Senart, and Noble 1920–1929: §§187, 358, 393, 415, 489, trans. Burrow 1940. On *vyarivala*, see Burrow 1937 s.v.

8. Burrow 1940: 71.

9. Document §489 (4–6) (I have modified the romanization): *vṛdha śilaprabha puṁñaṣena viharavala ete saṁgasya . . . /// re saṁgakarani kartavya yatha dhamena pruchidavo yo bhikhu saṁga*[*ka*]*rani sarva edeṣa* [*karta*] */// yena bhikhusaṁga atamaṁna bhaveyati.*

Turning to Pāli sources, in the Pāli Vinaya in the discussion accompanying Nissaggiya 5, we find the expression *āyasmā udāyi ohiyyako hoti vihārapālo,* "the Venerable Udāyin was left behind as *vihāra-pāla*."[10] This individual is the habitually misbehaving Udāyin, whose acts lead to the laying down of many rules.[11] We might presume from this that the assignment as *vihāra-pāla*, in this context at least, was no honor. The word also occurs in the context of the rule Pācittiya 42, where the *vihāra-pāla* is linked with one who is ill and one who is left behind.[12] Similarly, in the *Saṁyutta-Nikāya*, we find the following:[13] "Then at that time the Venerable Vaṅgīsa, a new monk, not long ordained, was left behind as *vihāra-pāla*." The two Chinese translations of the *Saṁyuktāgama* parallel the expression interestingly. One says:[14] 尊者婆耆舍直日住守, "Reverend Vaṅgīsa, *zhírì* 直日; *zhùcì* 住守," the other:[15] 時彼尊者婆耆奢、於僧直次守于僧房, "Then that Reverend Vaṅgīsa was *zhícì* 直次 for the monastic community, guarding the monastic cells." Here, both expressions indicate that the translators understood Vaṅgīsa's assignment to be made on a daily basis (*zhírì* 直日, *zhícì* 直次) to stay and look after (*zhùcì* 住守) things in the monastery. This is perhaps expected since we have already noted in our investigations of terms in *-vārika* the temporary nature of some assignments. Interestingly, neither of these Chinese translations appears to take *vihāra-pāla* as a technical term. Buddhaghosa's commentary to the *Saṁyutta-Nikāya*, the *Sāratthappakāsinī*, treats *vihāra-pāla* in the expression "Venerable Vaṅgīsa, a new monk, not long ordained, was left behind as *vihāra-pāla*" as follows:[16]

> *Vihāra-pāla* is used because he was not yet ordained a full year, not experienced in taking care of his robe and bowl. Then the Elder monks assign him to guard the monastery telling him to sit and look after the parasols, sandals, walking sticks and so on, and

10. Oldenberg 1879–1883: iii.208.22. The *Samantapāsādikā* (Takakusu and Nagai 1924–1947: 663.8–9) comments: *ohiyyako ti avahiyyako avasesako vihāravāraṁ patvā eko va vihāre ṭhito ti attho,* "The meaning of 'left behind' is the one who is left behind, remains, the one who stays in the monastery when it is his turn [to watch] the monastery." Note that the word is found spelled *ohīyaka, ohiyyaka, ohīyyaka, ohiyaka.*

11. See Malalasekera 1938: I.376.

12. Oldenberg 1879–1883: iv.94.7.

13. Feer 1884–1898: i.185.6–7, Vaṅgīsa, Nikkhanta (§VIII.1.2): *tena kho pana samayena āyasmā vaṅgīso navako hoti acirapabbajito ohiyyako vihārapālo.*

14. T. 99 (1215) (II) 331b12 (*juan* 45). Most unfortunately, the Sanskrit fragment of this sūtra is missing the crucial word(s). Enomoto 1994: 45 has conveniently noted the fragment in Sander and Waldschmidt 1985: 137, No. 1140, recto, first identified by Waldschmidt.

15. T. 100 (II) (250) 461b15–16 (*juan* 13).

16. Woodward 1929–1937: 268 (1.1.209): *vihārapālo ti so kira tadā avassiko hoti pattacīvaraggahaṇe akovido | atha naṁ therā bhikkhūā vuso imāni chattupāhanakattarayatthiādīni olokento nisīdāti vihārarakkhakaṁ katvā piṇḍāya pavisisuṁ | tena vuttaṁ vihārapālo ti.*

> they go for alms. Thus he is called *vihāra-pāla* [guardian of the monastery].

What is evident in these passages is that this assignment as one left behind—and in Pāli it appears that the term *vihāra-pāla* is always accompanied by *ohiyyaka*—is made to a monk, but one gains the impression that it is foisted upon those who cannot avoid it, those with no seniority or under some sort of punishment. If we follow the Chinese translators' interpretation, it was an assignment made on a daily basis.[17]

This understanding seems to be confirmed by a passage from the **Nandagarbhāvakrānti*, part of the *Mahāratnakūṭa* sūtra collection but a text which was, in fact, originally an extract from the Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya *Kṣudrakavastu*, and is now found in both locations in the Chinese and Tibetan canonical collections. The Chinese version of this text discusses the duties of the *zhīshìrén* 知事人, a term we have seen above with the generic sense of "administrator." But the Tibetan translations of both the **Nandagarbhāvakrānti* and the *Kṣudrakavastu* understand the equivalent term as **vihāra-pāla* (*khang skyong*). It is said that this **vihāra-pāla* is responsible for administering (*zhal ta bya=*vaiyāpṛtya*) what needs to be done for the community in the monastery:[18]

> When the monks go out to beg for alms, he should sweep the interior of the monastery and sprinkle it down. Taking fresh cow dung he should smoothly and evenly smear it [on the ground]. Concentrating his mind he must protect [the monastery] and assure that there is no loss or damage. If he needs advice, he should ask the community. If there are incense and flowers, he should hand them out to the community. At night he should close the gates, and at dawn he should open them. He must always wash and wipe down the privy and toilet area.[19] If the monastery has any damage, he should repair it.

17. The speculation of Satō 1963: 317, who refers to Pācittiya 2, that the *vihāra-pāla* might be a layperson seems to be in error.

18. Textual Materials 49. I translate the sūtra here, since it is slightly more detailed than the Vinaya text. The Tibetan translation of the sūtra was apparently translated from Yijing's Chinese version, probably by Chos grub, and I translate the Chinese in light of this Tibetan interpretation. See Sakurabe 1930–1932: 239; Ueyama 1967–1968/1978: 49; and Ueyama 1990: 127–128. This passage is quoted by Dōgen in his *Eihei Shingi* 永平清規, trans. Leighton and Okumura 1996: 128.

19. Gernet 1967: 307a has misunderstood the text here. He translates (from Chinese): "Il doit toujours laver et nettoyer les grandes et petits parcours destinés á la Déambulation [kyōgyō 經行]." The text reads 小大行處常須洗拭. Indeed, *xíngchù* 行處 alone may refer to a place for walking, but the Tibetan makes the meaning here very clear.

While it is not entirely clear that this should be understood as *necessarily* a monastic post, the context has the newly ordained Nanda undertaking this responsibility, a circumstance which seems to correspond precisely to what we have seen from the Pāli evidence. The position of this *vihāra-pāla*, then, is a menial one, very much that of a caretaker, maintenance man, or handyman.

In a location not far before this passage in the same Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya *Kṣudrakavastu*, we find another description of similar responsibilities. These, however, are specified as to be undertaken by the monk undergoing so-called *pārājika* penance, the *śikṣādattaka*, as we noticed above in our discussion of the *upadhi-vārika*. In this text, which closely parallels another in the *Pārivāsikavastu* of the same Vinaya, these duties are specified as follows:[20]

> Rising at the very break of day he shall open the gate. He shall remove the lamp-pots. He shall sprinkle down the monastery with water, sweep it and give it a fresh application of cow dung.[21] He shall clean the privy; he shall provide earth and leaves, and cool or warm water according to the time [of year].[22] He shall clean out the mouths of the drains. Knowing that it is time and arranging the seats, he shall provide the censer and incense. If he is able to perform the Proclamation of the Qualities of the Teacher, he shall do it by himself. If he is not, he shall request a reciter [to do so]. He shall verify the food preparation. If it has been prepared, climbing up on the roof he shall strike the *gaṇḍī*. In the summer he shall take hold of a fan [to cool] the monks. After that, after all those who have full ordination but before those who do not have full ordination, with calm demeanor and aware of his status as a non-monk, he shall eat. Having taken care of what needs doing for the meal,

20. Textual Materials 50. I have translated the Sanskrit here, with due attention to the other versions. I have refrained, however, from offering exhaustive notes. Partly, this is because this passage has already been treated by both Schopen 1996: 95 (with nn. 34–35), and 1998: 157–166 and passim; and Clarke 1999: 174–176, 256–258. I have found their work to be of great assistance. In particular, my translation owes much to that of Schopen, and on many doubtful points I have simply followed him. See his papers for careful and detailed attempts to set the passage in context.

21. These expressions are defined in *Kalyāṇamitra's *Vinayavastuṭīkā* (D 4113, *'dul ba, tsu* 268b2): *chag chag ces bya ba ni chus gdab pa'o || phyag dar zhes bya ba ni sa phyag pa'o || ba lang gi lci ba sar pas byug pa zhes bya ba ni de'i byug pas byugs pa'o ||*.

22. The Sanskrit reads *mṛttikā upasthāpayitavyā patrāṇi pānīyaṁ śītalaṁ vā kālānurūpataḥ*. The Tibetan in the *Kṣudrakavastu* has here *sa dang | lo ma dag dang | chu grang mo 'am | dron mo dus dang mthun par gzhag par bya*. I assume that the Sanskrit text has dropped a word. The Chinese has no mention of "cool or warm water according to the time [of year]," but does add *wùlìngquèshì* 勿令闕事, "he must not omit anything." Schopen 1998: 158 translates the Sanskrit: "Earth and leaves must be set out, or cool water, depending on the season."

> he shall store the seating mats and bedding in a hidden place. He shall dispose of the supports for the begging bowls.[23] Knowing that it is time, he shall sweep the [area around the] stūpa of the Tathāgata's hair and nails, and give it a fresh application of cow dung. Again, when it is time for the meeting he shall assign the seating mats and bedding, and he shall provide the censer. He shall perform the Proclamation of the Qualities of the Teacher, as [stated] before. He shall announce the date, saying "Venerables, may the monastic community listen! Today is the tenth day of the fortnight," and so forth, as the *upadhi-vārika*s announce.

The Chinese and Tibetan translations of the *Kṣudrakavastu* here continue differently from the Sanskrit of the *Pārivāsikavastu*: "For the sake of the *vihārasvāmin*[24] and the gods of the monastery, he shall announce the day by reciting verses."

As Schopen has pointed out, the main points here are cited in the *Vinayasūtra* as well.[25] What is remarkable about these two accounts is that the duties of the **vihāra-pāla* so closely parallel those to be assigned to one in disgrace. These comprise responsibilities for the daily maintenance of the physical plant of the monastery. In fact, at least on the sole basis of these two texts, the semimonk in disgrace, the *śikṣādattaka*, seems to have even greater responsibilities than does the **vihāra-pāla*, who is not called upon here to perform the Proclamation of the Qualities of the Teacher or announce the date.

23. I do not understand the word *pātrādhiṣṭhāna* or its Tibetan translation *lhung bzed kyi gzhi*. Nor is it helpful to find in *Śākyaprabha's *Āryamūlasarvāstivādiśrāmaṇerakārikāvṛttiprabhāvatī* (D 4125, *'dul ba, shu* 147b3) the putative definition: *lhung bzed kyi rten ni lhung bzed kyi gzhi yin no*, which informs us that *gzhi* means *rten*. The corresponding Chinese text has *shíqì* 食器, "utensils for eating," but states that these should be put back where they belong. As Schopen argues, the Sanskrit verb *chorayitavyam* (and, we might add, the Tibetan translation *dor bar bya*) suggests instead "throw away." Without some knowledge of the realia involved, a correct interpretation is impossible, and my translation is a guess. (It is possible, for instance, to speculate that if Indians ate off of leaves, these were to be thrown away; Chinese, of course, would have used nondisposable utensils, and the Chinese translation then a cultural rather than a literal one.)

24. The Chinese has "the *dānapati* who built the monastery," which means precisely the same thing as *vihārasvāmin*.

25. Sankrityayana 1981: 76.14–20, cited in Schopen 1996: 97n35: *upadhivārikena tata āgamyārocanaṁ saṁghe | viśeṣitasya | pakṣabhedena | vihārasvāmidevatārthañ ca gāthābhāṣāṇe bhikṣūṇāṁ niyogasya vacanam | adya śuklapakṣasya pratipad vihārasvāmino vihāradevatānāṁ cārthāya gāthāṁ bhāṣadhvam iti*. Schopen translates:

> By the monk in charge of physical properties then, when it is determined, there is the announcing to the Community of the particulars, of the time of the month, [and] the declaration of the duty of the monks in regard to the recitation of verse[s] for the benefit of the Owner and the gods of the *vihāra*. To wit: "Today is the first day of the bright half of the fortnight. You must recite the verses for the benefit of the Owner of the *vihāra* and for the gods of the *vihāra*."

Other passages confirm some of the *vihāra-pāla*'s duties. In the *Bhaiṣajya-vastu*, if I have understood the passage correctly, it is a yakṣa who cleans the monastery, sets out the cushions and water vessels and, acting as **vihāra-pāla*, rings the gong.[26] In the *Vinayavibhaṅga*, a **vihāra-pāla* is asked to ring the gong so that the monks may gather to expel unrepentant monks from the community.[27] (Here, Yijing once again demonstrates his flexibility, rendering what is the same word, in Tibetan at least, as *zhīshìrén* 知事人 and *shoùshì*[*rén*] 授事[人] in succeeding lines.)[28] And in the *Vinayasaṁgraha*, it is the **vihāra-pāla* who is responsible for gathering the monks and informing them: this person is the donor, this one the **vaiyāpṛtyakara*, and with these places of habitation the rain retreat will begin tomorrow.[29]

However, it is not only these two individuals, the **vihāra-pāla* and the *śikṣādattaka*, who have such responsibilities. As we have seen, it is also common for the *upadhi-vārika* to be assigned these duties. And in the *Poṣadhavastu* of the Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya, it is the *prahāṇapratijāgraka bhikṣu* who must "sprinkle down the meditation chamber with water, sweep it and give it a fresh application of cow dung, [set out the seating mats], clean the toilets, sweep them and give them a fresh application of cow dung, set out small leaves, and earth[30] and water."[31] A commentary quoting this passage in the *Ekottarakarmaśataka* adds:[32] "having shaken the *khakkara* ascetic's staff atop the monastery in order to gather [the monks], he rings the small gong. Then having announced the time, he recites the *Tridaṇḍaka* correctly, and does as he pleases."

To further complicate matters, and decrease the conceptual contrast among the **vihāra-pāla*, *upadhi-vārika*, and *śikṣādattaka*, at another place in

26. D 1, *'dul ba, kha* 116b5–6. It may be the same type of passage which is alluded to in Śīlapālita's *Āgamakṣudrakavyākhyāna*, D 4115, *'dul ba, dzu* 63b1: *gtsug lag khang na gnyug mar gnas pa ni gnod sbyin la sogs pa'o*. See, however, Schopen 2002: 386n73 (he tentatively identifies Śīlapālita's source in the *Kṣudrakavastu*, D 6, *'dul ba, tha*, 175b4).

27. D 3, *'dul ba, ca* 100b5–7.

28. T. 1442 (XXIII) 650b4–8 (*juan* 5).

29. D 4105, *'dul ba, nu* 170a7–b1: *gtsug lag khang skyong gis dgongs kar tshogs pa'i dus su dge slong gi dge 'dun rnams la sbyin bdag 'di zhes bya ba dang | zhal ta ba 'di zhes bya ba dang | spyod yul gyi grong 'di dag gis sang dbyar nye bar gnas par bya'o zhes brjod par bya'o* ||. I do not understand exactly where the Chinese parallel should be located in T. 1458 (XXIV) 564b(?) (*juan* 7). The parallel in the *Varṣāvastu*, noticed above on p. 46, n. 31, specifies that this announcement is made by a monk.

30. Tibetan has *bong rdog dang sa dang chu*; I do not understand the difference intended between *bong rdog*, a lump of earth, and *sa*, earth.

31. Textual Materials 51.

32. Textual Materials 52. This follows the portion of the *Poṣadhavastu* quoted above, as well as Hu-von Hinüber 1994: 292 (§§20–21.1): *yathāsukhaṁ karttavyaṁ. . .tṛdaṇḍako bhāṣitavyaḥ*. The *Poṣadhavastu* also mentions immediately before this the use of the *khakkhara* mendicant's staff as the *prahāṇagaṇḍī*, that is, what is used to announce things in the context of meditation practice (Hu-von Hinüber 1994: 292 [§19.3]). On the *khakkhara*, see von Hinüber 1992.

the same Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya, the **vihāra-pāla* (*gtsug lag khang skyong*) is indeed assigned calendrical responsibilities. He, along with the *saṁgha-sthavira*, the senior-most monk in the monastery, is ordered to keep track of the date, and the means by which this should be done are specified. But, once again, there are more complications: in the summary of the relevant passage in Guṇaprabha's *Vinayasūtra*, instead of **vihāra-pāla* we find *upadhi-vārika* as the title of the responsible official.[33] In another passage in the *Vinayasūtra*, while the Sanskrit text tells us that the *upadhi-vārika* is responsible for the daily sweeping of the monastery, the Tibetan translation of that sūtra assigns this responsibility to the *khang skyong*, that is, the **vihārapāla*.[34] One almost has the impression that in such cases the terms were seen as interchangeable (although there remain too many variables and unknowns for us to conclude this for certain).

We have seen that administrators such as the *navakarmika* sometimes have, in addition to what might be seen as their core responsibilities, additional financial tasks as well. Although not necessarily in the same category of responsibility as that of authorizing loans, for instance, we do find reference in the Mūlasarvāstivāda *Vinaya Uttaragrantha* to the stipulation that the **vihāra-pāla* is responsible for conducting the auction of the goods left by a deceased monk.[35] We do not, however, know whether this would necessarily have put him in a position from which he might, for instance, have embezzled or engaged in other violations of fiduciary responsibility, although this is certainly likely.

In the *Kṣudrakavastu*, if the owner of a monastery (**vihārasvāmin*) or his relatives are unable to take care of the monastery, some people in the vicinity are ordered to maintain the integrity of the monastic unit for five years. The exact sense of the expression used here to designate these people, *gtsug lag khang de'i nye 'khor gyi gtsug lag khang dag yongs su skyong bar byed ba rnams*, is not clear. Schopen first rendered the expression carefully with "guardians of *vihāras*," noting that it is not certain whether this is an administrative title.[36] Later, he

33. The canonical text is the *Vinaya Uttaragrantha*. D 7, *'dul ba, pa* 71b4–74a2, trans. Schopen 1998: 173, with comments on 175. There, Schopen points out the summary of this passage in the *Vinayasūtra* (Sankrityayana 1981: 76.17), which has not **vihāra-pāla* but *upadhi-vārika* (confirmed in Tibetan: D 4117, *'dul ba, wu* 60b7: *dge skos kyis gso sbyong gi tshe tshul shing brim pas dge slong rnams bgrang bar bya'o* ||). See also above p. 110, n. 32, Schopen's very cautiously stated speculation (175), "It is even not impossible that *gtsug lag khang skyong* is a non-standard rendering of *upadhi-vārika*," seems to me unlikely.

34. Sankrityayana 1981: 115.4–5 (§17.11.240): *vihāram upadhivārikaḥ saṁmṛjyāt pratyaham* = D 4117, *'dul ba, wu* 95b5–6: *khang skyong gis gtsug lag khang nyi ma re re zhing phyag dar bya'o* ||.

35. Schopen 2001: 131–132, citing S 8, *'dul ba, na* 122b5; D 7, *'dul ba, pa* 86a2; P 1037, *'dul ba, phe* 83b2. Here, **vihāra-pāla* is translated *gtsug lag khang skyong*.

36. The passage is in D 6, *'dul ba, tha* 230b2, trans. Schopen 1996: 110, and n. 60. In the Chinese version of this passage, T. 1451 (XXIV) 284b25–c25, there is no equivalent to **vihāra-pāla* at c7. (We may also note

suggested that this expression "might be a variant translation of the same title,"[37] namely, *gtsug lag khang skyong*, which does normally render **vihāra-pāla*. Still later, he referred to the phrase as "probably the same title."[38] But part of the question is whether the expression translates a title at all. I suspect that it rather is to be understood nontechnically as "those in the vicinity of that monastery who are charged with looking after the monasteries." The apparent plural marker *dag* attached to *gtsug lag khang* in the middle of what we might otherwise be tempted to take as a compound of **vihāra + paripāla*, as well as the use of *yongs su* (generally = *pari-*), argue against a simple interpretation of equivalence with **vihāra-pāla*. With only the materials I have been able to study so far, however, this particular problem seems insoluble.

It has proven difficult to locate the word *vihāra-pāla* in Mahāyāna sūtras. What seems to be a reference to this or a closely related word, however, is found in the *Drumakinnararājaparipṛcchā*, but without any specification of its sense.[39] I have so far been unable to locate other examples, although I suspect they exist.

At this point, we cannot help but notice a clear and obvious pattern: the same basic set of general responsibilities for the daily maintenance and care of the monastery is assigned by different sources, and even by the same sources in different places, to a range of named administrators: *upadhi-vārika*, *weínà*, and *vihāra-pāla*, not to mention the demoted monk in disgrace, the *śikṣādattaka*. What is more, some sources seem not to always strictly distinguish among these titles. This seems to hint, even if only in a so far rather vague and undefined way, at the flexibility of vocabulary found in our sources. We cannot, in light of such evidence, reasonably expect to define patterns of monastic administrative vocabulary that are universally applicable to all of our Indian sources. Again, whether the reasons for this lie in tradition-internal inconsistencies or geographic and/or temporal diversity, or arise from some other cause(s), we cannot say.

Even if we cannot always understand their precise contextual or relative meaning within the overall framework of Indian Buddhist monastic systems, however, the terms we have studied are, on the whole, both clearly Indian, in

---

here the likelihood that what Schopen has translated as "residents," *gnas pa rnams*, reflects *āvāsika*, a word we will study in the next chapter.)

37. Schopen 1998: 175.

38. Schopen 2001: 147n80.

39. The passage is found in Harrison's 1992 edition in paragraph 6E (pp. 113–114): *gtsug lag khang skyong yang skos shig*, "must assign also a **vihāra-pāla*," trans. T. 624 (XV) 356a10–11 (*juan zhong*): *dāng jiù qí qǐng* . . . *hùsìzhě* 當就其請 . . . 護寺者, and in T. 625 (XV) 375c7 (*juan* 2): *qǐng chaī shǒufǎngrén* 請差守房人. I owe thanks to G. Schopen for bringing this passage to my notice.

the sense that they were used in Indian texts, and Indic, in that linguistically they are genuine, even if occasionally rare, Indian (Sanskrit or Prakrit) words. At least one term, however, presents a linguistic conundrum. Its meaning is generally clear, in that it obviously is some administrative title, no less sharply defined by its usage than many other titles we have seen. But its phonological shape and whether it is an Indic term at all remain a mystery.

8

Momodi and *Āvāsika*

In a superbly detailed and careful study of the elusive term *mómódì* 摩摩諦 (EMC ma-ma-tεj^h),[1] Sylvain Lévi and Édouard Chavannes begin by drawing attention to a passage in the *Koṭikarṇāvadāna* in the Sarvāstivāda Vinaya containing the expression *jiùbǐqiū mómódì dìdìtuōluō* 舊比丘摩摩諦帝帝陀羅.[2] In an attempt to make sense of this enigmatic phrase, the authors then investigate its occurrences elsewhere. They thus draw attention at the outset to another passage in the Sarvāstivāda Vinaya, in which we find the likewise enigmatic phrase 舊比丘名共金作摩摩諦帝帝陀羅,[3] identifying the *jiùbǐqiū* 舊比丘 named Gongjin 共金[4] as *mómódì dìdìtuóluó* 摩摩諦帝帝陀羅. Lévi and Chavannes point here to the parallel story in the Pāli Vinaya, and notice there the corresponding phrase *kassapagotto nāma bhikkhu āvāsiko hoti tantibaddho*.[5] In this Vinaya story of Kassapagotta, the crucial passage reads as follows:[6]

1. Also written 摩摩帝.

2. Lévi and Chavannes 1915. My debt to this study in the following is pervasive. The passage cited here is T. 1435 (XXIII) 181a20–21 (*juan* 25), translated also in Chavannes 1910–1911: ii.259.

3. T. 1435 (XXIII) 218a17–18 (*juan* 30).

4. I do not understand this name, which one would expect to correspond somehow to the Pāli parallel's Kassapagotta.

5. Lévi and Chavannes 1915: 194–195.

6. Textual Materials 53, *Mahāvagga* IX.1.1. We find an almost exact parallel in the *Aṅguttara-Nikāya* (Morris and Hardy 1885–1900: i.236.23–24 [III.90.1]): *kassapagotto nāma bhikkhu paṅkadhyāyaṁ āvāsiko hoti*. In the Chinese parallel, T. 99 (830) (II) 213a8 (*juan* 30),

> Now at that time in the Kāsi country there was a village named Vāsabha; a monk called Kassapagotta was *āvāsika* [and] *tantibaddha* there; he exerted himself, thinking: "What if well-behaved monks who have not yet come should come, and well-behaved monks who are already here should live in comfort, and this residence should come to prosper, expand and increase?"

Lévi and Chavannes suggest that "the word *āvāsika* is clear; it designates a monk who lives in a fixed, permanent residence, in opposition to a nomadic bhikkhu." While the term *āvāsika* may indeed refer simply to a monk who dwells permanently in a certain place, as opposed to a wandering monk, there is more to it than this.[7]

There are other close parallels to the same Sarvāstivāda Vinaya passage, as well as another reference almost immediately afterward in the same *Koṭikarṇāvadāna*. There, we find the protagonist Koṭikarṇa referring to his ordination by his preceptor Mahākatyāyana with the expression *jiùzhù*(*bǐqiū*) *mómódì dìdìtuóluó jǐdù wǒ* 舊住 (比丘) 摩摩帝帝帝陀羅濟度我.[8] The precise meaning of this expression is not readily apparent ("The resident monk *mómódì dìdìtuóluó* saved me").

Returning to the example of Kassapagotta, in the Mahīśāsaka Vinaya we find the same expression with *mómódì*, but no mention of *āvāsika* or of *dìdìtuóluó* 帝帝陀羅,[9] while in a parallel in the Dharmaguptaka Vinaya we find only *jiùbǐqiū* 舊比丘.[10] Despite the fact that the term seems to be unknown to dictionaries, the equation of *jiùbǐqiū* 舊比丘 with *āvāsika* is quite clear. When the word *āvāsika* is actually attested in a Sanskrit fragment of the Sarvāstivāda

---

we find only *zhù* 住. The passage is not found in the fragmentary Sanskrit manuscript edited by Pischel 1904.

My translation owes much to those of Horner 1938–1966: iv.446, and Rhys Davids and Oldenberg 1881-1885/1899–1900: 256. Horner translated the crucial expression "a monk called Kassapagotta was a resident there, he was attached to the tradition." Rhys Davids and Oldenberg rendered: "There a bhikkhu called Kassapa-gotta had his residence, who was bound [to that place] by the string [of the religious duties which he had to perform there]."

7. For the *Critical Pāli Dictionary*, Trenckner et al. 1924–: s.v. *āvāsika*, *āvāsika* means "living in, residing at home, in (regular or permanent) residence, usually of a *bhikkhu* (opp. *āgantuka*); a resident (*bhikkhu*), staying at his (own) monastery and (or) tending it; incumbent of a *vihāra*." This contrast is frequently met with in texts.

8. T. 1435 (XXIII) 181c8, 14–15 (*juan* 25), trans. Chavannes 1910–1911: ii.263 as follows: "c'est lui qui, présidant depuis longtemps à la religion dans le royaume d'*A-che-mo-kia a-p'an-ti*, m'a sauvé," and "c'est, dans le royaume d'*A-che-mo-kia a-p'an-ti* [Açmaka avantî], la doctrine de ce vieux bhikṣu qui m'a sauvé." I think these translations are not entirely correct.

9. T. 1422 (XXII) 161a15 (*juan* 24), trans. Lévi and Chavannes 1915: 195–196.

10. T. 1428 (XXII) 885a16 (*juan* 44), in Lévi and Chavannes 1915: 197, where they render the crucial term "un vieux moine," which I think is an error.

Vinaya, for instance, it is indeed rendered by *jiùbǐqiū* 舊比丘.[11] The reverse is, of course, not always true. In the *Aṅguttara-Nikāya*, we find *āyasmā Dhammiko jātibhūmiyaṁ āvāsiko hoti*, which its Chinese parallel has as 爾時、尊者曇彌爲生地尊長, the term *zūnzhǎng* 尊長 apparently equivalent here to *āvāsika*.[12] Likewise, a *Majjhima-Nikāya* passage refers to two monks, Assaji and Punabbasuka, as *āvāsika*,[13] while the Chinese parallel characterizes the two monks as *jiù tǔdìzhǔ sìzhǔ zōngzhǔ* 舊士地主寺主宗主.[14] I do not understand this expression well, but it appears to mean "masters of the territory, masters of the temple, and masters of the lineage from long ago," understanding *jiù* 舊 not simply with the first expression but with the whole string. If this reading of the phrase is correct, it might be explained as an interpretive translation.

The question of how to understand the relation between *mómódì* and *āvāsika* is crucial to our attempt to understand the former. In a passage in the Mahāsāṁghika Vinaya,[15] we again find the complex expression *jiùbǐqiū mómódì* 舊比丘摩摩諦, this individual bearing responsibilities for taking care of the material needs of a visiting monk. Shall we understand this as an apposition, in which the *āvāsika*, *jiùbǐqiū* 舊比丘, is a *mómódì* 摩摩諦? Or do these terms refer to different things, aspects, or roles? There are a number of passages in the Dharmaguptaka Vinaya which suggest a juxtaposition of *jiùzhù bǐqiū* 舊住比丘, **āvāsika bhikṣu*, with *mómódì* and either *jīngyíngrén* 經營人 or *zhīshìrén* 知事人,[16] the latter two, as we have seen earlier, meaning roughly "manager" or "supervisor" in an apparently fairly broad sense. But there is also at least one passage which equally clearly seems to qualify *jiùzhùrén* 舊住人 as either *mómódì* or *jīngyíngrén*.[17] This is not easy to understand.

11. Rosen 1959: 81–82, §§6, 11=T. 1435 (XXIII) 41b18, 27 (*juan* 5), commentary to Niḥsargika Pātayantika 3.

12. Morris and Hardy 1885–1900: iii.366.3–4 (VI.LIV.1)=T. 26 (130) (I) 618b21 (*juan* 30).

13. Malalasekera 1938: I.225–227 understands Assaji-punabbasukā to refer to the followers of two monks, Assaji and Punabbasu (taking the *-ka* as a suffix indicative of group membership). This appears to be an error. The Chinese version has the names as *āshībeì* 阿濕貝 and *fúnàpóxiū* 弗那婆修, the latter close to Punabbasu, but not Punabbasuka (although, to be sure, the dropping of such a suffix is common in Chinese name transcriptions). None of the transcriptions cited by Akanuma 1931: 515 explicitly support the form with *-ka*. (In this regard, note also Bapat's remarks in Bapat and Hirakawa 1970: xlviii–xlix.) The problem requires reconsideration.

14. Trenckner and Chalmers 1888–1896: i.473.21 (70)=T. 26 (195) (I) 749c12–13 (*juan* 51). Ñāṇamoli 1995: 577 has rendered *assajipunabbasukā nāma bhikkhū kīṭāgirismiṁ āvāsikā honti* as "the bhikkhus named Assaji and Punabbasuka were residing at Kīṭāgiri." So too Horner 1954–1959: ii.147. I think, however, that it is not simply a matter of "residing."

15. T. 1425 (XXII) 251c6 (*juan* 3).

16. T. 1428 (XXII) 644a7, 28–29 (*juan* 12, in Pātayantikā 14; see Hirakawa 1994: 206), and 644c12–13, 29 (*juan* 12, Pātayantikā 15).

17. T. 1428 (XXII) 863c6 (*juan* 41): 舊住人若摩摩帝若經營人.

Before we try to resolve the relation between *mómódì* and *āvāsika*, we must also be sure that we understand what the latter itself means. The term *āvāsika* seems to have several different uses or dimensions of meaning. As we saw, one signification is that of "permanent resident," opposed to *āgantuka*, or visiting monk, the latter being one who wanders into a community (technically, into a certain *sīmā* or local monastic boundary), without taking up permanent residence, while the former is attached to that community (although he may, of course, leave if he wishes). This distinction, without other nuance, seems to be at work, for example, in a discussion in the Pāli Vinaya's *Mahāvagga* concerning the Uposatha rite.[18] But the distinction is complicated by several factors, not all of which can be ascribed to different sectarian usages. The first of these factors is that, alongside *āvāsika*, we also find the term *naivāsika*.[19] These two designations appear in at least one instance to be used interchangeably, in a passage from the *Avadānaśataka* which we will look at in detail below. There, the Sanskrit text as we have it alternates between the two forms, but with a single referent, within the same narrative flow.[20] Within the technical vocabulary of the Vinaya, however, the two are distinguished. The Mūlasarvāstivādin *Vinayavastuṭīkā* of *Kalyāṇamitra defines the two terms as follows:[21]

> The *āvāsika* is one who has been in residence for a short time, and does not [yet] know the internal and external customary [behaviors of the monastery]. The *naivāsika* is one who has been in residence for a long time, and knows the internal and external customary [behaviors of the monastery].

If the *āvāsika* is, as we will see below, sometimes responsible for various administrative tasks, this does not appear to contradict our supposition that administrative assignments are often made to those with very low seniority, which of course might be the case for one in residence only a rather short time

18. *Mahāvagga* II.28–34 (Oldenberg 1879–1883: i.128–134).

19. This pair has also been noticed by Hu-von Hinüber 1994: 191. However, some of her treatment is hard to understand. For instance, she refers in n. 5 to Derrett 1983: 50—but the term which he represents there in English with "resident saṁgha monks" is in the text rather *saṁmukhībhūta* (Singh 1983: 85.17). In the following paragraphs, this occurs together with *saṁgha*, but the word *āvāsika* is not used here in the *Sphuṭārthā Śrīghanācārasaṁgrahaṭīkā* at all, and the discussion is thus not relevant to Hu-von Hinüber's concerns.

20. See Textual Materials 54, and below, p. 191. The Tibetan translation of the *Avadānaśataka* uses only a single term, *gzhi ba*, which in Mhy. §8745 is given as equivalent to *naivāsika*. The Chinese translation of the *Avadānaśataka* is too different to allow a simple comparison.

21. D 4113, *'dul ba, tsu* 313b4–5, quoted in Kieffer-Pülz 1992: 365–366: *gnas pa zhes bya ba ni dus thung ngur gnas pa phyi nang gi rgyus mi shes pa'o || gnyug mar gnas pa zhes bya ba ni dus yun ring du gnas pa phyi nang gi rgyus shes pa'o ||*.

and generally unfamiliar with the customs of the monastery. However, other texts seem to define the two terms differently. For the likewise Mūlasarvāstivādin commentary *Āgamakṣudrakavyākhyāna* of Śīlapālita, a **naivāsika* is a permanent resident.[22] And corresponding to this, at least in part, in the Theravādan *Samantapāsādikā*, we find the distinction between the two terms expressed as follows:[23]

> They are called "*āvāsika*" because their residence [*āvāsa*] is here. *Āvāsa* means monastery. He among them who exerts himself in undertaking the responsibility of doing new construction, repairing old [structures] and so on—they are the *āvāsikas*.[24] But those who just dwell in the monastery are called *nevāsika*.

This suggests a quite different distinction from that specified by *Kalyāṇamitra. Based upon the description of his duties, here the *āvāsika* seems, for example, to nearly parallel the position that we discussed earlier under the title *navakarmika*. (Note that in at least one other context, in *Śākyaprabha's *Āryamūlasarvāstivādiśrāmaṇerakārikāvṛttiprabhāvatī*, a **naivāsika* is portrayed as engaged in plowing a field belonging to the monastic community, while in another spot he is said to wander from place to place.)[25] Moreover, *Kalyāṇamitra's and Buddhaghosa's definitions seem contradictory. For the former, it is the *naivāsika* who is the knowledgeable one, and therefore presumably qualified for more technically demanding assignments, while in the latter, as for the *Āgamakṣudrakavyākhyāna*, the *nevāsika* is a simple resident. Of course, the *Samantapāsādikā* belongs to the Ceylonese Theravāda, and thus one might be tempted to ascribe the distinction to sectarian or geographic distance. But the *Vinayavastuṭīkā* and the *Āgamakṣudrakavyākhyāna* both belong to the same Mūlasarvāstivāda tradition. Therefore, this divergence and the partial agreement between Śīlapālita and Buddhaghosa remain puzzling.[26] No simple answer is likely to resolve this discrepancy. In any case, having tried to understand its putative equivalent *āvāsika*, the general if not exact meaning of

22. D 4115, *'dul ba, dzu* 92a3: *gnyug mar gnas pa zhes bya ba ni rtag tu gnas pa'o*. Also 149a2: *gnyug mar gnas pa zhes bya ba ni gang rtag par gnas pa'o*.

23. Takakusu and Nagai 1924–1947: 613.27–31: *āvāsikā hontī ti ettha āvāso etesaṁ atthī ti āvāsikā āvāso ti vihāro vuccati | so yesaṁ āyatto navakammakaraṇapurāṇapaṭisaṅkharaṇādibhārahāratāya te āvāsikā | ye pana kevalaṁ vihāre vasanti te nevāsikā ti vuccanti*. Quoted in Hu-von Hinüber 1994: 191; quoted and translated in Kieffer-Pülz 1992: 366n13.

24. I do not understand what appears to be the lack of agreement in number; I would expect **ye*. . . *te*.

25. See Textual Materials 55 and 56, and p. 185, n. 18 below. Note that *naivāsika* can also refer to nonhuman resident guardians of a monastery, as discussed by Schopen 2002: 377.

26. There is some evidence, hinted at from time to time, of so-called northern influence on Buddhaghosa, but this complicated problem remains to be comprehensively investigated.

which is comparatively clear, we must now see what we can make of the term *mómódì*.

We saw above that the *mómódì* seems to have some responsibility for caring for visiting monks. We see this connection repeatedly in other sources, for instance, in another passage in the Sarvāstivāda Vinaya in which it is at least implied that the responsibility for taking care of visiting monks is that of the, as the text says, *mómódì dìdìtuóluó sēngfángzhǔ* 摩摩諦帝帝陀羅僧房主, "the *mómódì dìdìtuóluó* master of the monastery/monastic cells."[27] Although this expression as a whole is far from clear, the connection of the *mómódì* with visiting monks, at least, is plain. Elsewhere in the same Sarvāstivāda Vinaya, the **āvāsika* is made responsible for visitors.[28] Likewise, Lévi and Chavannes quote a vignette from the *Samyuktāgama* in which someone suffers in his present existence because of misbehavior toward visitors as a *mómódì* in his past life:[29]

> Thus I have heard. At one time the Buddha was dwelling in Śrāvastī—[abbreviated] up to—Venerable Maudgalyāyana said: "On the road, I saw a being with a large body. His tongue was long and broad, and burning iron nails nailed his tongue. He rose into the air and left, crying and weeping." —[abbreviated] up to:
>
> The Buddha addressed the monks: "This being in a past age in Śrāvastī renounced the world in the preaching of the Buddha Kāśyapa, became a monk and acted as *mómódì*. He abused the monks, saying: 'Elders, you should get out of here! Our limited supplies cannot support you.' Each [monk] left as he wished, to

27. T. 1435 (XXIII) 224b9–10, 18 (*juan* 31). Satō 1963: 318, without any reference to Lévi and Chavannes 1915, cites the passage and equates *mómódì dìdìtuóluó* 摩摩諦帝帝陀羅 with *tantidhara=jīngchí* 經持, and with Pāli *tantibaddho*.

28. T. 1435 (XXIII) 264b26–c8, 247a21ff. (*juan* 34). In T. 1470 (probably a Chinese composition; see below n. 30), the *zhísuì* 直歲 or administrator appointed for the year has ten duties, most of which directly concern the care of visitors. See Textual Materials 57.

29. Textual Materials 58. I omit the stock close of the sūtra, but otherwise the translation renders the entire short text. Lévi and Chavannes 1915: 198–200 actually quote two episodes from the *Samyuktāgama*: T. 99 (532 and 533) (II) 138c11–139a6 (*juan* 19), but as the second is not as clear, I omit it here.

Such references also occur elsewhere. There is little point in repeating here the references already provided by Lévi and Chavannes 1915. However, since they were writing before the publication of the Taishō edition of the Chinese canon, we might briefly indicate the locations of some of the passages they translated: Lévi and Chavannes 1915: 201–202=T. 2130 (LIV) 987b21 and 1007a10–13 (*juan* 4). (I have some hesitation in accepting their rendering of *zhīfǎrén* 知法人 as "un homme qui connait la loi," and *zhīfǎsìzhǔ* 知法寺主 as "le directeur du temple connaissant la loi." Should not *zhī* 知 here have the same sense it has in the term *zhīshì* 知事, namely, ordering, directing, administering?) Lévi and Chavannes 1915: 202=T. 2131 (LIV) 1074c29–1075a4 (*juan* 1); the quotation is from T. 2126 (LIV) 244c19ff. Lévi and Chavannes 1915: 210=T. 2127 (LIV) 302b27–c1 (*juan xia*). Since later lexical works tend to copy earlier ones, at least from the point of view of trying to understand something about the Indian sources of such terminology, their utility is questionable.

> seek a prosperous and pleasant place, a place full of robes and food, where robes, food, seats and sleeping mats, and medicinal herbs [that is, the four requisites] could be adequately obtained. The monks who had formerly dwelt there all left, and visiting monks hearing this also did not come. Because of this transgression, he was in hell experiencing unlimited suffering. As an additional punishment after hell, now he obtained this body, and he continues to experience these sufferings. Monks, it is truly just as Mahā-Maudgalyāyana saw."

Here, it seems that the *mómódì* is a figure of some administrative authority, since he suggests that monks leave the monastery and go elsewhere. We may also recall here the passage we noticed in Chapter Two of this volume, from paragraph 16 of the *Ratnarāśi-sūtra*, in which precisely this punishment of a tongue pierced by nails is promised the monastic administrator who speaks improperly to others. Moreover, as we will see in some detail in Chapter Ten, stories following this basic formula are quite common, although the titles of misbehaving administrators vary.

More specific information about the *mómódì* comes from other texts. For instance, in a discussion in an early Chinese translation, the *Dabiqiu sanqian weiyi* 大比丘三千威儀,[30] several lists of the virtues of the *mómódì* are given. One reads as follows:[31]

1. [The *mómódì*] does not take the goods of the universal community to apply them as the goods of the stūpa.
2. He does not take the goods of the universal community to apply them as goods of an individual monk.
3. He does not take the goods of the stūpa to apply them as goods of the universal community.
4. He does not take the goods of the stūpa to apply them as goods of the community of monks.

30. The translation is attributed, almost certainly wrongly, to An Shigao. See Hirakawa 1970: 193–196, who believes that the text belongs to the period 334–417 C.E. (see also Shio 1931: 149). Hirakawa 1970: 280–281 considers portions of this text to have been compiled in China, rather than translated. But partly since he does not believe that the word *mómódì* was actually used in Chinese Buddhism, he considers the portions of the text containing this word to be of Indian origin. The problem requires further consideration.

31. Textual Materials 59. See the translation in Lévi and Chavannes 1915: 216. On the duties of the similarly named *móbólì* 摩波利, see T. 1470 (XXIV) 923b11–924a4, and Lévi and Chavannes 1915: 205–208.

The *Dabiqiu sanqian weiyi* also lists fifteen virtues concerning the duties of the office designated with another difficult term, *bōnísēng móbólì* 鉢泥僧摩波利 (see Lévi and Chavannes 1915: 213). For the text and a translation, see Textual Materials 60.

5. He does not take the goods of the community of monks to apply them as the goods of the stūpa.
6. He does not take the goods of the community of monks to apply them as the goods of the universal community.

This quotation could come from any number of discussions of the fiduciary responsibilities of almost any named monastic administrator. In this sense, while it does not help us to directly clarify the identity of the *mómódì*, it does help to make it very clear that the term belongs to precisely the same class and category of adminstrative terminology as those titles designated by most other terms we have examined. And this text is not unique in its characterization. The Mahāsāṁghika Vinaya also contains a passage based on very similar notions:[32]

> If a monk acts as *mómódì*, and the stūpa is lacking property but the monastic community has property, then he might consider as follows: "The offerings made by gods and men to the community of monks are all through the grace of the Buddha. One who makes offerings to the Buddha is then making offerings to the community of monks." This *mómódì* who [with such reasoning] takes monastic property in order to repair the stūpa is guilty of a *pārājika* offence [of theft].
>
> If the stūpa has property but the monastic community is lacking property, he might consider thus: "Offerings are made to the monks, and the Buddha too is among them." He may then take the stūpa's property to make offerings to the monastic community. The *mómódì* who utilizes [property in this way] is guilty of a *pārājika* offence.
>
> If the stūpa has no property and an individual monk has property, it may borrow [the property] and use it according to the rule. But a clear itemization must be made, stating: "At such-and-such a time [property] was borrowed; at such-and-such a time it shall be returned."
>
> If a monk does not have property but the stūpa does have property, he may borrow [the property] and use it according to the rule, and so on as before.

32. Textual Materials 61. Tomomatsu 1932: 108 suggested, rather oddly, that this passage contains not only a statement of the Mahāsāṁghika view but also a criticism of that of the Mahīśāsaka, but cf. pp. 213–214, where he seems to attribute the view, more reasonably I think, to the Kāśyapīya or Dharmaguptaka. Note also that Tomomatsu 1932: 108, 213 glosses (translates?) *mómódì* as *bunpai chiji* 分配知事, that is, "one in charge of distribution." See also Silk 2002.

The text then goes on to emphasize the necessity of recording the loan, and so forth. We have seen very similar statements a number of times, although the central technical terms have differed. We recall in particular that in a parallel to the same Mahāsāṁghika Vinaya, fortunately preserved in Sanskrit, the *Abhisamācārika*, these same responsibilities were attributed to monks assigned temporary duty for the week, fortnight, or month, the *saptavārika*, *pakṣa-vārika*, and *māsa-vārika*. We also recall paragraphs 10–12 from the *Ratnarāśi*, from which it is again clear that the *mómódì* discussed here has exactly the same range of responsibilities as does the *Ratnarāśi*'s *vaiyāpṛtyakara*, with whom moreover he shares the threat of the same type of punishment for his misdeeds. The exact sense of *mómódì* here, however, remains elusive, as illustrated for example by its juxtaposition with *zhīshìrén* 知事人, from which it must therefore be distinct in some way.[33]

Nevertheless, even if we can with considerable confidence offer such conclusions concerning the administrative role of the *mómódì*, the problem of the shape of the word *mómódì*, which strongly suggests itself as a transcription of some foreign term, probably Indic or Central Asian, remains. As Lévi and Chavannes point out,[34] in the sixth-century dictionary *Fanfan yu* 飜梵語 the term is glossed *sìzhǔ* 寺主,[35] almost certainly intended as equivalent to *vihārasvāmin*, as we noticed earlier in our discussion of the *weínà*.[36] From the point of view of the hypothesis of Schopen, that the *vihārasvāmin* is generally the lay owner of a monastery,[37] this indication seems anomalous, and of course from a phonetic point of view, it would be very difficult, if not entirely impossible, to argue that *mómódì* reflects an Indic *vihārasvāmin*, no matter what Prakritic transformations one might posit. Another suggestion has been made by H. W. Bailey, namely, that a Prakrit form of **mahākarmāntika*, "great worker," might appear as **mahā'ammantī*, becoming **māmmattī*, this being represented as *mómódì* 摩摩諦.[38] There are a number of problems with this, including the important, but not decisive, fact that the form **mahākarmāntika* is not itself anywhere attested.[39] In addition, not to put too fine a point on it, just because certain phonetic changes are, in theory, possible does not mean that they have happened.

33. T. 1425 (XXII) 388b9 (*juan* 20).

34. Lévi and Chavannes 1915: 201.

35. T. 2130 (LIV) 995c1 (*juan* 2): 摩摩諦譯曰寺主.

36. See also the eleventh-century *Fanyi mingyi ji* 翻譯名義集 T. 2131 (LIV) 1074c29 (*juan* 1), where the transcription *píhēluóshāmǐ* 毘呵羅莎弭, obviously *vihārasvāmin*, is offered as an alternative to *mómódì* 摩摩帝 and then equated with *sìzhū* 寺主.

37. Schopen 1996.

38. Bailey 1949: 131–132.

39. As we have seen, even *karmāntika* itself is rather rare, although this in and of itself proves nothing.

I think that Bailey's suggestion should be treated with a considerable degree of caution. In a phonetically much more likely move, although still inconclusive, Lévi and Chavannes connect the term *dìdìtuóluó* 帝帝陀羅 (EMC tɛjʰ-tɛjʰ-da-la) with **tithidhara* and *zhírì* 直日.[40] The Chinese title *zhírì* 直日 does exist alongside *zhíyuè* 直月 and *zhísuì* 直歲, indicating those appointed for a day, a month, or a year, respectively. However, while, as we have seen, we do have such Indic terms as *māsa-vārika*, obviously equivalent to *zhíyuè* 直月, the Indic form **tithi-dhara* itself remains unattested. Moreover, while Buddhist Sanskrit does form compounds in °*dhara* (such as *vinaya-dhara* and so on), these do not seem to be of the type required here. The problem remains unsolved.

As we noticed above, another enigmatic term found in the Pāli parallel we quoted at the beginning of our discussion is *tanti-baddha*. Both the first English translators of the Pāli Vinaya, Oldenberg and Rhys Davids, and then more recently Horner have understood *tanti-baddha* following Buddhaghosa,[41] interpreting, as Horner translates, that "he was fettered by the *tanti* (tradition, sacred text, thread, string) of things to be done (duties, obligations) in that residence." This looks very much like Buddhaghosa had no idea what the term really denotes and resorted to an etymological "explanation." Sasaki, without further evidence, goes so far as to list *tanti-baddha* as a monastic administrator, offers the Chinese (or Japanese?) equivalent *zhíshì/shitsuji* 執事, refers to the story of Kassapagotta cited above, and defines *tanti-baddha* as follows: "He takes charge of all daily minor matters such as receiving newly arrived monks."[42] In my opinion, if anything this points rather to the duties we might expect of the *āvāsika*. In sum, I do not think any of this takes us closer to understanding what *tanti-baddha* really means, which suggests that it in turn cannot help us to understand what *mómódì* itself means.

In the conclusion to their study, Lévi and Chavannes translate a passage from the Sarvāstivāda Vinaya in which reference is made several times to the *chángzhù bǐqiū* 常住比丘. This term, which they translate as "moine résidant à demeure," they also understand, perhaps rightly, as equivalent to *āvāsika*. The person appointed to this post through an ecclesiastical legal process (*karman*), the text tells us, should prepare a vacant dwelling for occupancy as follows:[43]

40. Lévi and Chavannes 1915: 203.

41. Takakusu and Nagai 1924–1947: 1145: *tantibaddho ti tasmin āvāse katabbatātantipaṭibaddho*. Horner 1938–1966: iv.446; Rhys Davids and Oldenberg 1899: 256. Lévi and Chavannes 1915: 220 attempt to explain this with reference to *Ṛgveda* 6.24.4 and *Gobhila* 3.6.7. I am less than convinced by this, and wonder whether we might better seek in Middle Indic for some clue as to the true meaning of *tanti* here.

42. Sasaki 1999: 150, 274n86.

43. Textual Materials 62. Lévi and Chavannes 1915: 221–222. The passage was also noted by Tomomatsu 1920: 17.

> The permanent resident monk in charge of vacant monastic cells should wander around the monastic cells. First he should repair the stūpa.[44] Next he takes care of the affairs of the monastic community of the four quarters. Then he takes charge of the affairs of preparation of food and drink for the monastic community. Then he takes charge of distribution of belongings. Then he takes charge of the affairs of monks of high, middle and low rank.

Lévi and Chavannes then go on to conclude, from this and the other evidence they have amassed:

> According to this account, the *āvāsika* monk was in principle only the delegate of the monastic community left on the spot to guard and maintain a monastic dwelling for visiting monks when a householder agreed to receive them. We thus circumvent the obstacle posed by the regulations which forbid the community to possess goods. The monastery remained more or less fictitiously the property of a householder. An inevitable transformation bit by bit substituted for this nominally lay ownership a frankly ecclesiastical property; thus it is that the *mómódì*, the *āvāsika* monk, "permanently established" as he was, became a *vihārasvāmin*, an "owner of the monastery." The double meaning attributed to the term *mómódì* well indicates the two stages of this evolution.

This conclusion seems to me rather problematic on several counts. First, I cannot see that, one episode with a clear parallel aside, the equation of *mómódì* with *āvāsika* has been clearly established. Even if we conclude that we understand the scope of the *āvāsika*'s duties well, and these substantially correspond to those of the *mómódì*, this does not in turn allow us to identify the two since, as we have seen, such responsibilities are widely shared by a number of otherwise distinctly titled monastic administrative officers as well. The phonology of the word *mómódì*, of course, remains opaque. Regarding the specific suggestions of Lévi and Chavannes, although prima facie there seems little doubt that more than one evolution in the meaning of a technical term went on over time—not to mention the likely regional variations in usage we have remarked on several times—there is, as far as I can see, no evidence that this was the case in the present example. If I understand Lévi and Chavannes correctly, they seem to be positing a transformation which took place before the final

44. Not "temple," as Lévi and Chavannes have it.

codification of the Buddhist monastic codes, traces of which can yet be discerned. This is a very difficult case to make, and particularly in the present example seems to me heavily influenced by the a priori assumption that, in an earlier stage, monks did not own their own monasteries. I do not think that this can be proven to be the case. Moreover, it does not seem that *āvāsika* can ever be reliably identified with *vihārasvāmin*, as the two appear as entirely different roles in all cases. We are forced to conclude here, I am afraid, that we are unable to fully trace the history of the term *mómódì* at present. That it has, in its use and in the responsibilities attributed to it, a character similar to that of other monastic administrators is clear and will become more so as we continue to examine materials bearing on other such roles.

9

Classified Lists of Administrators

As we observed at the outset, any effort to come to terms with the administrative vocabulary of Indian Buddhism in a comprehensive fashion would entail a thoroughgoing study of the entire extant Vinaya literature, at the very minimum.[1] This is something far beyond the scope of the present study, and may remain a task for a future generation of scholars. Nevertheless, having offered a limited examination of a limited number of terms, it is appropriate now to attempt to provide some sort of general overview of the remainder of the picture, insofar as it is visible at present.

The paradigmatic administrator in the Vinaya literature is the monk-arhat Dravya Mallaputra.[2] His duties exemplify the basic administrative tasks, those of distribution. Fundamentally, these are classified as the distribution of food and shelter, although the Vinayas elsewhere exhibit their concern with clothing as well. The last is dealt with differently, however, because the distribution of food and lodging is a daily affair, while the apportionment of clothing is an occasional business, and therefore the administration of the former

1. See already Tomomatsu 1920 for some preliminary indications, with notices of a number of important passages.

2. Oddly, this figure has not been much noticed by modern scholars—but see Malalasekera 1938: I.1059–1060; Akanuma 1931: 140–141; Mochizuki 1932–1936: 3537a–c; Sasaki 1978. Cf. also Kabata 1957. The different Vinaya accounts of his responsibilities are translated and investigated in Tomomatsu 1965: 81–96.

stands as the paradigmatic case of distribution. While many sources naturally also discuss the storage and care of donations already in the possession of the monastic community, in keeping with a putative early or primitive ideology, which makes little accommodation for possessions as such, whether private or corporate, the scope of early administrative tasks is implied to include only distribution, and not storage or guardianship. Similarly, we also lack evidence for the hypothesis that earlier sources imagined only temporary appointments to posts of administrative responsibility, with later monasticism instituting more permanent structures, although not necessarily because such a transformation did not occur. The limitations that our sources impose on us have been mentioned before in this book, and this question of diachronic development is yet another area in which we are restricted in what we are able to say precisely by this poverty of evidence. In any case, the central focus on distribution, whether or not truly primitive from a historical perspective, is pervasive in the literature we have available to us

In the Pāli Vinaya, the responsibilities of Dabba Mallaputta are explained directly as the management of the assignment of lodging and distribution of meals.[3] In a version of the basic story in the tale collection *Zabaozang jing* 雜寶藏經, it is said that Dravya Mallaputra is always engaged in administering the affairs of the community (*héng yíng sēngshì* 恒營僧事), and he is called by the Buddha the first among administrators (*yíngshì dìyī* 營事第一).[4] In explanation of the karmic seeds which led to his present condition, the text says that in the past time of the Buddha Kāśyapa, he was also an administrator; the term used here is either *shíjiān* 食監 or *cāngjiān* 倉監 (the forms are graphically quite similar and easily confused), with the former indicating one responsible for meals, and the latter one responsible for the stores. It is impossible to determine apodictically which was the original reading, although for the reasons given above, the former suggests itself as preferable.

Those extant Vinayas belonging to the Sthavira sects, which is to say all extant versions save the Mahāsāṁghika Vinaya, divide the administrative tasks of Dravya Mallaputra into two general groups: those concerned with lodging and those concerned with food. These "job titles" appear to be mentioned in the Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya with the terms *śayanāsana-vārika* and *bhaktoddeśika*.[5] When we turn to the Mahāsāṁghika Vinaya, however, we get

3. Oldenberg 1879–1883: ii.74ff. (*Cullavagga* IV.4) and iii.158.27–160.13 (Sāṅghādisesa VIII.1.1–4).

4. T. 203 (IV) 457a5–29 (*juan* 2), §18, trans. Willemen 1994: 49–50 (who erroneously uses the form Darva instead of the correct Dravya).

5. Sasaki 1993: 68 refers to the Mūlasarvāstivāda classification into *fēnwòjùzhě* 分臥具者 = *gnas mal 'bog pa* and *fēnshízhě* 分食者 = *zas la sko ba* (D 3, *'dul ba, ca* 267b4, 269b2 = T. 1442 [XXIII] 695b27, 696a5 [*juan* 13]). In his speculations on the Sanskrit forms of these terms, however, Sasaki apparently overlooked their attestation in the *Vinayasūtra*, quoted above (p. 104), as *śayanāsana-vārika* and *bhaktoddeśika*.

a different and more detailed breakdown into nine categories. There, we read the following:[6]

> At that time there was a monk named Dravya Mallaputra, entreated by the community of monks to control the nine affairs [*zhòngsēng bài diǎnzhī jiǔshì* 衆僧拜典知九事].[7] The nine affairs are:
>
> 1. to administer in order [of seniority] the assignment of sitting and sleeping mats,
> 2. to administer in order [of seniority] the appointment [of monks] to accept invitations [as representatives of the community],
> 3. to administer in order [of seniority] the distribution of living quarters,
> 4. to administer in order [of seniority] the distribution of robes,
> 5. to administer in order [of seniority] the distribution of flowers and incense,
> 6. to administer in order [of seniority] the distribution of the fruits of trees and melons,
> 7. to administer in order [of seniority] those in charge of [producing] hot water [for baths?],
> 8. to administer in order [of seniority] the distribution of snacks,[8]
> 9. to administer in order [of seniority] as he wishes the assignment to people of the responsibility for tasks.
>
> This is called being entreated by the monks to control the nine affairs.
>
> When he assigns the sitting and sleeping mats this Venerable[9] with the small finger of his right hand sends forth a light assigning [quarters] in order according to classification. [Using that beam of light as a pointer to indicate the assignment of quarters, in order he assigns a living chamber] to wilderness dwellers together with wilderness dwellers. To alms beggars together with alms beggars. To wearers of

6. Textual Materials 63. Translated also by Sasaki 1993: 61. See on this, Tomomatsu 1965: 84–85, and more generally for this and parallel versions 83–92.

7. The phrase "nine affairs" could very well stand as a translation of *nava-karma*, although naturally in a different sense from the one we examined above (see p. 88, n. 62). When I remarked on my observation of this coincidence to my friend Shizuka Sasaki, he reminded me that he had mentioned the very same to me many years before.

8. Following Sasaki; literally, "assorted foods."

9. The text from here on is compared to its recapitulation at T. 1425 (XXII) 394c9–14 (*juan* 21). It is also paralleled in the Sarvāstivāda Vinaya (T. 1435 [XXIII] 22a8ff. [*juan* 4]); Mahīśāsaka Vinaya (T. 1421 [XXII] 15ab [*juan* 3]); Dharmaguptaka Vinaya (T. 1428 [XXII] 587a25ff. [*juan* 3]); and the Pāli passages referred to above regarding Dabba Mallaputta.

> rag robes... To those who eat in one sitting . . . To those who sleep in a sitting posture . . . To those who live in the open air. . . . To those who sit upon scattered grass[?] . . . To those who recite sūtras . . . To dharma masters . . . To those who study the Vinaya . . . [To *srotaāpannas* . . . To *sakṛdāgāmins* . . . To *anāgāmins* . . .][10] To arhats. To possessors of the three knowledges . . . To possessors of the six superknowledges. And to those who do not observe correctly the four modes of behavior.[11]

Here we see that not only are the administrative tasks listed, but another, seemingly highly heterogeneous list of "monastic specializations" is also found.[12] Another thing to note about this list is that while other Vinayas also mention these or similar basic administrative tasks, they are implied as apportioned to different individuals, but in this Mahāsāṁghika version, Dravya Mallaputra himself carries out all of the nine tasks enumerated. The significance of this difference, however, if any, is not clear.

Although not presented in connection with Dravya Mallaputra, other Vinayas do have similar lists of administrative responsibilities; those for which we have Indic-language sources have been noticed above. Those which we know only in translation are, however, also worthy of our attention, although the absence of verifiable Indic terminology is a serious obstacle to our appreciation of their meaning and significance, especially in a comparative light.[13]

Some of the most detailed lists are found in Mūlasarvāstivāda texts, although their mutual relations are not always entirely straightforward. In the *Ekottarakarmaśataka*,[14] both the Tibetan translation and what is putatively Yijing's rendering of the same text contain lists with similar items.[15] The twelve items run as follows:[16]

1. gnas khang bsko ba[17]	chāifēnfángrén 差分房人
2. zas la bsko ba	fēnfànrén 分飯人

10. The material in brackets is skipped by the reprise.

11. Note the application in this listing of the *dhutaguṇas*, the ascetic purification practices.

12. I say that this list *seems* heterogeneous because it may be only that I have failed to detect the operative organizing principle, not that none exists.

13. For one instance of comparison between Pāli and Chinese sources, see Konno 2004b.

14. In the incipit of the text itself we find the title *ekottarakaṁ karmaśataṁ*, D 4118, *'dul ba, wu* 100b1. There is no relation between this text and the story collection called *Karmaśataka*, studied below.

15. Yamagiwa 2001: 321n14, has remarked on the confused connection of the two "versions," the Tibetan translation and that of Yijing.

16. D 4118, *'dul ba, wu* 251b1–255a3; T. 1453 (XXIV) 499a25–b7 (*juan* 10).

17. The text remarks: *dge slong lhags pa lhags pa rnams la gnas khang bsko ba*. The reduplication (for which see Beyer 1992: 136) suggests that the sense here is those who have already arrived in the monastery, and are staying, but not permanently.

3.	thug pa ’brim pa	fēnzhoūrén 分粥人
4.	bag chos ’brim pa	fēnbǐngguǒrén 分餅果人
5.	phran tshegs ’brim pa	fēnzhūyǒuzáwùrén 分諸有雜物人
6.	dge ’dun gyi snod spyad ’drub pa	cángqìwùrén 藏器物人
7.	dbyar dge ’dun gyi gos kyi rnyed pa sbed pa[18]	cángyīrén 藏衣人
8.	dbyar dge ’dun gyi gos kyi rnyed pa ’ged pa	fēnyīrén 分衣人
9.	dge ’dun gyi dbyar gyi gos ras chen sbed pa	cángyǔyīrén 藏雨衣人
10.	dge ’dun gyi dbyar gyi gos ras chen ’ged pa	fēnyǔyīrén 分雨衣人
11.	dge ’dun gyi mngag gzhug pa	záqūshǐrén 雜驅使人
12.	dge ’dun gyi mdzes ’chos	kānjiǎnfángshèrén 看撿房舍人

These items may be understood on the basis of the Tibetan translation as reflecting the following underlying Sanskrit terminology:

1. *vihārôddeśaka
2. *bhaktôddeśaka
3. *yavāgū-cāraka
4. *khādya-cāraka
5. *yatkiṁcic-cāraka
6. *saṁghabhāṇḍa-gopaka
7. *varṣāsaṁghacīvaralabha-gopaka?
8. *varṣāsaṁghacīvaralabha-bhājaka?
9. *saṁghavarṣāśāṭī-gopaka
10. *saṁghavarṣāśāṭī-bhājaka
11. *saṁgha-preṣaka
12. *saṁghaprāsādi-vārika

It is curious that the Tibetan translation continues, however, with items 13–20, apparently to be subsumed under item 21:[19]

18. This word is found in the *Vinayavibhaṅga* of the Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya, D 3, *’dul ba, cha* 195a5f. This seems to be abbreviated in the Chinese translation, T. 1442 (XXIII) 745c (*juan* 23).

19. After item 20, we find *dag ni las sna ma dag gi khongs su ’dus so*, suggesting, as noted, that 13–20 are to be included in 21. Following 21, the text adds *lag pod ni lag gi bla’i khongs su ’dus so*. An interlinear note in the Chinese translation makes explicit that its list consists of twelve items. However, the following three items in the larger overall list of ecclesiastical actions of which this subset is a part also appears to refer to individuals: *jiǎnpíngzhèngrén* 簡平正人, *zhòngjiǎnrén* 重簡人, *chuánfùzhēngrén* 傳付諍人. Subsequently, however, the list continues with *xíngfǎchóu* 行法籌, *guānzàoxiǎofángdì* 觀造小房地, *guānzàodàsìdì* 觀造大寺地, *lìngbìchújiéshì* 令苾芻詰

13. sder spyad 'brim pa	*bhājana-vārika
14. gnas mal 'bogs pa	*śayanāsana-vārika
15. gnas mal byi bo 'bogs pa	*muṇḍaśayanāsana-vārika
16. shing tog 'brim pa	*phala-bhājaka
17. chu'i zhal ta ba	*pānīya-vārika
18. bang rim gyi zhal ta ba	*pariṣaṇḍa-vārika
19. sgye'u cu bsrung ba[20]	*chaṇḍika-vārika
20. sra brkyang sped pa	*kaṭhina-bhājaka
21. lag gi bla	*navakarmika

The list of twelve items is also found in the *Vinayasaṁgraha*, a text of Viśeṣamitra, whom Schopen dates to the seventh or eighth century.[21] This list closely corresponds to that in the *Ekottarakarmaśataka*:[22]

1. gnas khang bsko ba	fēnfànrén 分飯人
2. zas la bsko ba	fēnzhoūrén 分粥人
3. nas thug 'drim pa	fēnbǐngrén 分餅人
4. bca' ba 'drim pa	fēnwòjùrén 分臥具人
5. phran tshogs 'drim pa	fēnzhūzáshìrén 分諸雜事人
6. snod spyad sbed pa	cángqìwùrén 藏器物人
7. gos sbed pa	cángyīrén 藏衣人
8. gos 'ged pa	fēnyīrén 分衣人
9. dbyar gyi gos ras chen sbed pa	cángyǔyīrén 藏雨衣人
10. dbyar gyi chos ras chen 'ged pa	fēnyǔyīrén 分雨衣人
11. mngag gzhug pa	zá(qiǎn)qūshǐrén 雜(遣)驅使人
12. mdzes chos pa	kānjiǎnfángshèrén 看撿房舍人

Once again, these may be understood on the basis of the Tibetan translation as reflecting the following Sanskrit terms:

1. *vihārôddeśaka
2. *bhaktôddeśaka
3. *yavāgū-cāraka

事, *bùlísēngqiézhīyī* 不離僧伽胝衣, *yǔyíngzuòbìchúwòjù* 與營作苾芻臥具, and so on. The meaning of many of these items is not clear to me, and their correspondence to the Tibetan list, if any, is difficult to discern.

20. The Derge edition spells the word so, but we recall that earlier we saw the same as *sge'u chung* in the *Mahāvuytpatti* and *Vinayasūtra*. Probably the latter spelling is correct.

21. Schopen 2002: 372.

22. D 4105, *'dul ba*, *nu* 127a7–b1; T. 1458 (XXIV) 545a6–10 (*juan* 4). Note that the first item in the Tibetan list corresponds to the fourth in the Chinese; otherwise the lists correspond in order.

4. *khādya-cāraka
5. *yatkiṁcic-cāraka
6. *bhāṇḍa-gopaka
7. *cīvara-gopaka?
8. *cīvara-bhājaka?
9. *varṣāśāṭī-gopaka
10. *varṣāśāṭī-bhājaka
11. *preṣaka
12. *prāsādi-vārika

Elsewhere in the Chinese translations of the *Ekottarakarmaśataka*, we find the following listing, so far unidentified in the supposedly corresponding Tibetan translation:[23]

1. fēnwòjùrén 分臥具人	*śayanāsana-vārika
2. zhǎngyīwùrén 掌衣物人	?
3. fēnyīrén 分衣人	*cīvara-bhājaka
4. cángqìwùrén 藏器物人	*bhāṇḍa-gopaka
5. shoùshìrén 授事人	?
6. fēnfángshèrén 分房舍人	*vihārôddeśaka
7. yíngshìrén 營事人	?
8. kānjiǎnfángshèrén 看撿房舍人	*prāsādi-vārika

Another Mūlasarvāstivāda text, the *Vinayakārikā*, is also found in both Tibetan translation and a version translated into Chinese by Yijing. It too claims to contain a list of twelve items. The forms of the terms here are constrained by the versification of the text, and identifying twelve items in the Tibetan version is not easy (again, the Sanskrit suggestions are offered on the basis of the Tibetan):[24]

1. chāiqiǎnfēnfàn 差遣分飯	a. zas ['gyed pa]
2. fēnzhoū [分] 粥	b. 'o thug ['gyed pa]
3. fēnfáng 分房	c. 'bras bu 'gyed pa
4. xíngbǐngguǒ 行餅果	d. snod spyad 'drub
5. fēnyúzáwùrén 分餘雜物人	e. sra brkyang
6. jiéchǐnàqìjù 羯恥那器具	f. chos gos sbed pa

23. T. 1453 (XXIV) 470b1–471b4 (*juan* 4). Note that although the text states there to be twelve classifications, it does not list them all. I have so far been unable to find a parallel to this passage in the Tibetan version of this text, D 4118.

24. Textual Materials 64. T. 1459 (XXIV) 633c9–14 (*juan zhong*).

7. cángshǒuzhīfāluó 藏守支伐羅	g. chos gos 'gyed pa
8. fēnyīrén 分衣人	h. dbyar gyi ras chen sbed pa
9. shǒuyǔyīzhě 守雨衣者	i. khang skyong
10. píhēluóbōluó 毘訶羅波羅[25]	j. mngag gzhug
11. shǐxíngqìchígānshuǐ 使行器持竿水	k. sder spyad zhal ta ba
12. qūwūrén 驅烏人	l. rtsod pa 'gegs
	m. chu 'drim
	n. bya rog la sogs skrod pa
	o. mal stan 'dug stan stobs pa
	p. zas 'dun 'jig rten bzlog pa(?)

These lists seem to be coordinated as follows:

1 – a	*bhakta-bhājaka
2 – b	*yavāgū-bhājaka
3 – o(?)	[*śayanāsana-vārika?]
4 – c	*phala-bhājaka
6 – e	*kaṭhina-?
7 – f	*cīvara-gopaka
8 – g	*cīvara-bhājaka
9 – h	*varṣāśāṭī-gopaka
10 – i	*vihāra-pāla
11 – m(?)	*pānīya-cāraka[26]
12 – j	*preṣaka
5 – ø	[*yatkiṁcic-cāraka]
d – ø	[*bhāṇḍa-gopaka]
k – ø	[*bhājana-vārika]
l – ø	[*adhikaraṇa-]
n – ø	[cf. Mhy. 9310: *bya rog gam khva skrod nus pa* = *kākottārasamartha*]
p – ø	?[27]

Sarvāstivāda lists have many similarities to those of the Mūlasarvāstivāda, although they are presented in various ways. One list is rather long:[28]

25. This form appears later in the same text, T. 1459 (XXIV) 649c17 (*juan xia*).

26. The entire text reads 斯人所遣使行器持竿水. I am not certain where to isolate the technical term, if indeed one is here at all.

27. This may indicate one who keeps people away from the assembly during meals.

28. T. 1435 (XXIII), extracted from 248a3, b2, 10, 13; 249a11, b1, 15, 24, c17–18; 250a8, 22, b1, 4, 18, 23–24, c13; 251a7, 10, 13 (*juan* 34).

1.	zhīshìrén 知事人	?
2.	zhīfūwòjùrén 知敷臥具人	*śayanāsana-vārika
3.	zhīshí bǐqiū 知食比丘	*bhaktoddeśaka bhikṣu
4.	zhīshírén 知食人	*bhaktoddeśaka?
5.	fēnzhōurén 分粥人	*yavāgū-bhājaka
6.	fēndàibōnàrén 分帯鉢那人	?[29]
7.	fēnyàorén 分藥人	[*bhaiṣajya-bhājaka?]
8.	zhīzuòqì bǐqiū 知作器比丘	?
9.	chángzhù bǐqiū zhī mǒjiǎ kōngzēngfāng 常住比丘知某甲空增坊	*āvāsika bhikṣu — —(?)[30]
10.	fēnchùrén 分處人	?
11.	shǒuhùyīrén 守護衣人	*cīvara-gopaka?
12.	shǒuyīrén 守衣人	*cīvara-gopaka?
13.	fēnyīrén 分衣人	*cīvara-bhājaka
14.	fēnyùyīrén 分浴衣人	*varṣāśāṭī-bhājaka
15.	weínà 維那	*karmadāna?
16.	fēnchùshāmírén 分處沙彌人	[cp. sāmaṇera-pesaka]
17.	jìngrén 淨人	*kalpikāraka? *ārāmika?
18.	shǐjìngrénshuài 使淨人率	?
19.	shǐjìngrénzhǔ 使淨人主	?

This list seems to distinguish, at least sometimes, between monastic and nonmonastic titles, as in items 3 and 4, which are identical save that the former specifies that it refers to a monk. However, items such as 11–14 are rather clearly monastic titles, without however any mention of the word *monk* which we do see in items 3, 8, and 9. We notice some overlap with lists cited above, but also some new terms, among which 15, *weínà*, is interesting. As we discussed earlier, the identification of this translation with the Indic *karmadāna* is not entirely straightforward, and its inclusion in such lists seems to be unique to this example. Another list from the same Vinaya is very brief:[31]

1.	fūwòjùrén 敷臥具人	*śayanāsana-vārika
2.	shǐshāmírén 使沙彌人	[cf. sāmaṇera-pesaka]
3.	shǐshǒuyuánrén 使守園人	[cf. ārāmika-pesaka]

29. This term obviously contains a transliteration, EMC taj^{h}-pat-na^{h}, but I have no good idea what it could represent.

30. The term (expression?) seems to mean "**āvāsika bhikṣu* in charge of such-and-such/so-and-so's empty monastic cell(s)."

31. T. 1435 (XXIII) 418a20–25 (*juan* 56).

4. chǔfènshòuqǐngrén 處分受請人	?
5. diǎnzhīzhòngshìrén 典知衆事人	?

Most such lists give the impression of centering around the same general ideas, with some independent distinctions the precise meanings of which are often not clear. As a final example belonging to a Sthavira sect, a Dharmaguptaka list reads as follows:[32]

1. yíngshì bǐqiū 營事比丘	?
2. sēngfēnzhōu 僧分粥	*yavāgū-bhājaka
3. chāiqǐnghuì 差請會	?
4. fūwòjù 敷臥具	*śayanāsana-vārika
5. fēnwòjù 分臥具	*śayanāsana-bhājaka
6. fēnyùyī 分浴衣	*varṣāśāṭī-bhājaka
7. fēnyī . . . chaī bǐqiūshǐ 分衣 . . . 差比丘使	*cīvara-bhājaka?
8. chaīshāmíshǐ 差沙彌使	[cf. sāmaṇera-pesaka]

As we have seen above, item 1, *yíngshì bǐqiū* 營事比丘, is sometimes employed as a translation of *vaiyāpṛtyakara*, but not with the type of regularity that would allow us to offer even a tentative restitution of an underlying Indic original the translation of which it represents.

Finally, there are several very long Mahāsāṁghika lists. One is included in a list of twenty-eight ecclesiastical acts (*karman*), of which the last eighteen refer to plainly administrative or managerial roles. These eighteen catalog as follows those in charge of[33]

1.	diǎnzhīchuángrù 典知床褥	beds and seats
2.	diǎnzhījiànshí 典知鑒食	?
3.	diǎnzhīchāicìshí 典知差次食	handing out food in order [of seniority]
4.	diǎnzhīfēnfáng 典知分房	distribution of cells
5.	diǎnzhīqǔyī 典知取衣	taking robes
6.	diǎnzhīzhǎngyī 典知掌衣	caring for robes
7.	diǎnzhīfēnyī 典知分衣	distribution of robes

32. T. 1428 (XXII) 944b2, 945a5, 11–13 (*juan* 51).

33. T. 1425 (XXII) 422a21–29 (*juan* 24). The ten preceding items are *chūjiémó* 出羯磨, *bùlíyīsù* 不離衣宿, *líyīsù* 離衣宿, *shìfángchù* 示房處, *shìzuòdàfángchù* 示作大房處, *yǒushìzuòqiánfángchù* 有示作前房處, *xíngbōrén* 行鉢人, *xíngshèluórén* 行舍羅人, *shìwàidào* 試外道, *chízhàngluònáng* 持杖絡囊. I do not understand these well. On this Mahāsāṁghika *mātṛkā*, see Clarke 2004.

8.	diǎnzhīqǔdié 典知取氎	taking in fine cloth[34]
9.	diǎnzhījǔdié 典知舉氎	caring for fine cloth
10.	diǎnzhīfēndié 典知分氎	distribution of fine cloth
11.	diǎnzhīfēnhuá 典知分華	distribution of flowers
12.	diǎnzhīfēnxiāng 典知分香	distribution of incense
13.	diǎnzhīfēnguǒ 典知分果	distribution of fruit
14.	diǎnzhīfēnwēnshuǐ 典知分温水	distribution of hot water
15.	diǎnzhīfēnzábǐng 典知分雜餅	distribution of cakes?
16.	diǎnzhīsuíyìjǔ 典知随意舉	?
17.	diǎnzhīfēnzhōurén 典知分粥人	distribution of gruel
18.	diǎnzhīfēnxiǎoxiǎozáwù 典知分小小雜物	distribution of trivial items

It is difficult to suggest possible Indic equivalents for many of the items in these lists above. For some of the terms for which I have not suggested Indic parallels, I have instead offered speculative translations, but such suggestions can be nothing more than fairly literal, etymological renderings. While many of the translations seem fairly obvious, such a procedure cannot guarantee that we understand the real meaning or significance of the titles. We should recall here, as a helpful comparison, that the translations of monastic offices offered by Holmes Welch in his wonderful study of Chinese monastic life almost never correspond to the etymological sense of the Chinese titles.[35] On the basis of his detailed study of (the remnants of) a living system, Welch determined the duties and responsibilities of the offices in question, and then attempted to offer appropriate renderings of titles on that basis (sometimes inspired, it is true, by not entirely parallel Christian monastic models). Thus, for him, *weínà* is "precentor," *diǎnzuò* 典座 is "chef," and so on. Since we will never be able to follow this course, it may be that the most we will ever be able to accomplish will be to deduce the responsibilities of the holders of individual titles through careful studies of their use in the literature. This will be a long process and one which, given the heterogeneity of our sources, may ultimately not yield any uniformity. As I have suggested, the localization and plural origins of our sources have led to a situation in which it appears that multiple titles are used for the same set of responsibilities, and multiple sets of responsibilities are assigned to the same administrative title. It may never

34. The precise sense of *dié* 氎 is not clear to me, but it appears to indicate a type of fine cloth (see Wang 2002: 559). None of the possible Indic equivalents, such as *karpāsa-picu* or *paṭa(ka)*, seem to help very much. It is, in fact, even possible that no very precise meaning was intended, and the term was interpreted situationally.

35. See Welch 1967.

be possible to sort all of this out, which is why at least for the present I refrain in principle from translating such titles. This, however, does not mean that we should ignore the suggestive hints we do find here and there, for example, in some of the notations in the auto-commentary to the *Vinayasūtra* which I have quoted in the notes to this book. Further study of this and other commentaries on the *Vinayasūtra* and allied works, as well, of course, as further comprehensive studies of the entire complex of systems of monastic administration in general, will be sure to greatly improve our understanding of such terminology.

Another possible set of hints might come from the lists of five qualifications, possession of which permits one to be appointed to an administrative post, a catergory we have previously noted. The first four of these are standard and general: one must not be prone to lust, hatred, delusion, or fear. The fifth item is particular to the type of post to which the individual in question might be appointed.[36] That is, the administrator must know some particular thing, appropriate to his pending appointment. Examples are found in Pāli and Sanskrit in, respectively, Theravāda and Mūlasarvāstivāda texts. Since the same set of five items is also found in the Sarvāstivāda, Mahīśāsaka, Dharmaguptaka, and Mahāsāṁghika Vinayas, preserved only in Chinese, it may be considered to be broadly pan-Buddhist.[37] In the Pāli Vinaya, we find the expression used with reference to the *senāsana-gāhāpaka* and *patta-gāhāpaka*. In these cases, the fifth item is *gahitāgahita*, that is, he must know "what is properly taken and what is not."[38] Further examples are found in the lists of administrative roles we mentioned earlier from the *Aṅguttara-Nikāya* and the *Cullavagga*. Each of these terms is mentioned with the standard list of qualifications, with item five as follows:[39]

1. bhattuddesaka	uddiṭṭhānuddiṭṭha
2. senāsana-paññāpaka	paññattāpaññatta
3. bhaṇḍāgārika	guttāgutta
4. cīvara-paṭiggāhaka, sāṭiya-, patta-gāhāpaka	gahitāgahita
5. cīvara-, yāgu-, phala-, khajjaka-bhājaka	bhājitābhājita

36. This was pointed out quite correctly already by Härtel 1956: 146, §108.6. So too Hu-von Hinüber 1994: 283n3, paraphrasing Härtel, and Durt 1979: 438.

37. For example: T. 1435 (XXIII) 146b9–10 (*juan* 20)=254b10–11 (*juan* 35), 206c29–207a3 (*juan* 29), 250b27–28 (*juan* 34); T. 1421 (XXII) 154c1–5 (*juan* 23); T. 1425 (XXII) 334b9–11 (*juan* 13); T. 1428 (XXII) 918c26–29 (*juan* 47). Numerous other examples could be cited. See also Durt 1979: 438.

38. Textual Materials 65 (on which, see Härtel 1956: 158 [§114]), and Oldenberg 1879–1883: iii.246.34–247.1 (Nissaggiya 22; XXII.2.1).

39. Morris and Hardy 1885–1900: iii.274.15–275.17; Oldenberg 1879–1883: ii.175.36–177.26 (VI.21.1–3), trans. Horner 1938–1966: v.246–249. (See Trenckner et al. 1924–: I.14b, s.v. *agati*.)

6. appamattaka-vissajjaka	vissajjitāvissajjita
7. ārāmika-, sāmaṇera-pesaka	pesitāpesita

Here the *bhattuddesaka* (1), the one who assigns meals, is specifically one who knows what is (properly) alloted and what is not. The *senāsana-paññāpaka* (2), who informs monks of the sleeping arrangements, or assigns the beds, knows what has been (properly) assigned and what not. The *bhaṇḍāgārika* (3), who is responsible for the utensils or the stores, must know what has been (properly) preserved, and what not. Those who take care of the robes, outer cloaks, and bowls, *cīvara-paṭiggāhaka*, *sāṭiya-*, and *patta-gāhāpaka* (4), must know what is (properly) taken, and what is not. Those who distribute the robes, gruel, fruit, and solid food, *cīvara-*, *yāgu-*, *phala-*, and *khajjaka-bhājaka* (5), must know what has been (properly) distributed, and what not. The one who is responsible for distributing miscellaneous items, *appamattaka-vissajjaka* (6), must know what has been (properly) disposed of, and what not. Finally, those responsible for overseeing the *ārāmikas* and *sāmaṇeras, ārāmika-* and *sāmaṇera-pesaka* (7), must know whether they are (properly) looked after, or not. The *Cullavagga* specifies only for the distributor of miscellaneous items the nature of these items, including needle and scissors, water pots, sandals, and minor items of dress, as well as honey and ghee, clearly for medicinal use.

We notice that almost all of the categories in this list denote the fifth item by means of a modified replication of the final element of the compound used to designate the administrative title itself (that is, a past passive participle corresponding to an agentive nominal form derived from the same verbal root): *uddiṭṭa* with -*uddesaka, paññatta* with -*paññāpaka, gahita* with -*gāhāpaka, bhājita* with -*bhājaka, vissajjita* with -*vissajjaka,* and *pesita* with -*pesaka*. For our purposes, therefore, this list is less informative than we might have hoped. Only in the case of *gutta* with *bhaṇḍāgārika* is the verb form used etymologically independent of the term it is describing (although even here we recall that the Sanskrit equivalent of *bhaṇḍāgārika* is *bhāṇḍa-gopaka*, and the Sanskrit form of *gutta* is *gupta*, from the same root as *gopaka*). We find precisely the same pattern in other sources.

Mūlasarvāstivādin literature provides similar examples for differently named administrative posts, many preserved in Sanskrit. For example, the *Adhikaraṇavastu* of the Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya speaks of a resolver of disputes, *adhikaraṇasaṁcāraka bhikṣu*, as follows:[40]

40. Textual Materials 66. Cf. *Vinayasūtra* (Sankrityayana 1981: 108.14–15 [§13.1.27]): *pratyāgate mūlasaṁghe nādhikaraṇasaṁcārakasaṁmatiḥ*. D 4117, *'dul ba, wu* 90a7: *phyir 'ongs na dge 'dun bzhi pos rtsod pa sbed pa bsko'o* ||.

> Then the monastic community shall appoint[41] a monk as one in charge of [resolving] disputes. A monk endowed with five characteristics, if not appointed as one in charge of disputes, should not be appointed, and if appointed should be removed [from this position of authority]. Which five? He acts out of lust, out of hatred, out of delusion, out of fear, and he does not know which disputes have been [properly] brought about, and which not. A monk endowed with these five characteristics, if not appointed as one in charge of disputes, should not be appointed, and if appointed should be removed. But endowed with five [opposite] characteristics, a monk not [yet] appointed as one in charge of disputes should be appointed, and if [already] appointed should not be removed. Which five? He does not act out of lust, nor out of hatred, nor out of delusion, nor out of fear, and he knows which disputes have been [properly] brought about, and which not. Endowed with these five characteristics, a monk not [yet] appointed as one in charge of disputes should be appointed, and if [already] appointed should not be removed.

This same wording is found, *mutatis mutandis*, repeated throughout the Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya. In the same *Adhikaraṇavastu*, the text discusses the monk responsible for the distribution of voting sticks or tallies, *śalākā-cāraka bhikṣu*.[42] The fifth item in this case is that he knows when the voting tallies have been (properly) distributed, and when not (*cāritācāritaṁ ca śalākāṁ jānāti*).[43] (Note, however, that the *Vinayasūtra*'s auto-commentary seems to suggest that the *śalākā* are perfumed, distributed, and so on by the monk responsible for bedding, *gnas mal pa'i dge slong*, which agrees with what is said in the *Varṣāvastu*).[44] In the case in the *Poṣadhavastu* of the monk who takes

---

Notice the "dispute resolver" in the Dharmaguptaka Vinaya, T. 1428 (XXII) 739c22 (*juan* 25): *duànshìrén* 斷事人, and 918a5ff.: *duànshìbǐqiū* 斷事比丘, the latter in the **Adhikaraṇaśamatha Vastu*. These terms have been discussed briefly by Hirakawa 1970: 304–305 (and 647), but his statement that the Pāli equivalent is *ubbāhikā* requires further specification; see Trenckner et al. 1924–: s.v. *ubbāhikā* (II.530b). The "mysterious" Sarvāstivāda and Mahāsāṁghika equivalents remain enigmatic: *tàlàzhà* 闥賴吒, *tàcìzhà* 闥刺吒 (clearly an error for *tàlàzhà* 闥刺吒), *tàlàzhàlì* 闥賴吒利, and *wūhuíjiūluó* 烏廻鳩羅 (see the discussion in Durt 1979: 437 covering these and other related terms). Of the first three, the first is read in EMC t^{h}at-laj^{h}-traɨ^{h}, the second (with correction) t^{h}at-lat-traɨ^{h}. They probably represent some form of Indic *sthalastha* (cf. Pāli *thalaṭṭha*).

41. In this stock expression, Sanskrit *saṁmantavya* suggests a translation something like "is to be authorized, approved, agreed upon." But Tibetan *bsko bar bya* and, in other sources, Chinese *chāi* 差 suggest instead "appoint," which I follow.

42. For details on the practice of using such tallies, see Durt 1979.

43. Textual Materials 67.

44. The *Vinayasūtra* (Sankrityayana 1981: 3.2 [77.31]) says *apāraṇe 'nekasya*. To this corresponds D 4117, *'dul ba, wu* 61a7: *de stobs pa bsko bar bya'o || mi nus na du ma'o ||*. Concerning this, the auto-commentary says (D 4119, *'dul ba, zu* 93b7–94a1): *de stobs pa bsko bar bya'o zhes bya ba la | de'i sgras ni gnas mal stobs pa yang*

care that things are suitable for meditative practice, *prahāṇa-pratijāgraka bhikṣu*, the fifth item is that he knows what has been attended to for the sake of meditative practice, and what has not.[45] In the *Pravāraṇāvastu*,[46] the **pravāraka bhikṣu* is required to distinguish between a correctly held *pravāraṇā* ritual at the end of the rain retreat, and one which is incorrect. In the *Varṣāvastu*, one who provides bedding and seats to the monks must know when bedding and seats have been (correctly) provided, and when not.[47] A passage in the *Kaṭhinavastu* is somewhat more detailed and adds an additional layer of qualifications that are unique, as far as I know, to this case:[48]

> Then a monk shall be appointed as one in charge of spreading the kaṭhina cloth. A monk endowed with five characteristics, if not appointed as one in charge of spreading the kaṭhina cloth, should not be appointed, and if appointed should be removed [from this position of authority]. Which five? He is one who has not spent the rain retreat [in this community], one who has interrupted his rain retreat, one who entered the rain retreat late, one who spent the rain retreat elsewhere, and one who is under *pārājika* penance [*śikṣādattaka*]. Others too endowed with five characteristics should not be appointed: one undergoing *pārivāsa* penance, one undergoing *mūlapārivāsa* penance, one undergoing *mānāpya* penance, one under *mūlamānāpyacāra* penance, and one who has been suspended. Others endowed with five characteristics should not be appointed: one who acts out of lust, out of hatred, out of delusion, out of fear, and does not know which kaṭhina cloth has been [properly] spread, and which not. But endowed with five [opposite] characteristics, a monk not [yet] appointed as one in charge of spreading the kaṭhina

---

bsdus pa'o || mi nus na du ma'o zhes bya ba ni gcig gis gnas mal stobs par mi nus pa na | gnas mal stobs pa du ma bsko || bar bya'o zhes bya ba'i don to ||. See too the *Vinayasūtraṭīkā* of Dharmamitra, D 4120, *'dul ba, yu* 130a5ff.

As discussed below in p. 201, n. 15, the *Varṣāvastu* refers to the *śayanāsanagrāhaka bhikṣu*, translated as *gnas mal stobs pa'i dge slong* and *fēnwòjù bìchú* 分臥具苾芻. See Durt 1979: 434b–435a, who cites T. 1458 (XXIV) 564b (*juan* 7), which corresponds to D 4105, *'dul ba, nu* 170a, both, however, without the particular technical term in question. Durt 1979: 438b also points out that in the Mahīśāsaka Vinaya, the fifth item has ten parts, and thus in full fourteen qualifications are listed (T. 1421 [XXII] 154c19–26 [*juan* 23]).

45. Textual Materials 68. See also the *Ekottarakarmaśataka*, D 4118, *'dul ba, wu* 195b2–5. It may be that this corresponds to T. 1453 (XXIV) 470b2–4 (*juan* 4), but if so, the latter is much abbreviated.

46. Textual Materials 69. Reconstructed in Sanskrit from parallels from the *Kaṭhina-* and *Poṣadhavastu* in Chung 1998: 147–148, §2.3.2.1, trans. p. 230.

47. Textual Materials 70. See also 71.

48. Textual Materials 72. My translation is indebted to that of Chang 1957: 68, and the notes in Matsumura 1996: 196–197. See also Härtel 1956: 146, §108.6. The corresponding Chinese translation has been translated into English by Chang 1957: 68n3.

> cloth should be appointed, and if [already] appointed should not be removed. Which five? He does not act out of lust, nor out of hatred, nor out of delusion, nor out of fear, and he knows when the kaṭhina cloth has been [properly] spread, and when not.

Occasionally, the variable fifth qualification is shared by several different titles, as we saw in the Pāli list, above. Although I have not noticed this same pattern of overlap in the Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya, the *vihāroddeśaka* in that Vinaya's *Śayanāsanavastu* is qualified by his knowledge of what is and is not properly alloted, just as is the Pāli Vinaya's *bhattuddesaka*.[49]

All told, these references are less informative than we might have hoped. They seem to emphasize, above all, that the monks in question must, in addition to the basic qualifications of good character, know something about the task they are to be assigned. How this might have worked in practice we can only guess, but it is no great leap to imagine that many monks would not, in the end, have been qualified for many of the administrative tasks requiring some mastery over, for example, the details of regulations concerning certain ritual procedures. This may be the key to appreciating the significance of the formula we have just examined. Namely, the particular technical responsibilities for the distribution of voting tallies, or of donated cloth, and so on, must be undertaken by one with extensive knowledge of the requisite rituals and regulations. If this is correct, it might also be taken to imply, through however a perhaps dangerous *argumentum e silentio*, that candidates for such posts were not required to demonstrate mastery over a broader body of disciplinary or ritual knowledge. In other words, if the central requirement for service as a distributor of lodging is, in addition to general morality, a specific knowledge of the process of such distribution, we might conjecture that no thoroughgoing mastery of Vinaya procedures concerning other matters was either required or expected. We note, for instance, the complete absence in such discussions of terms such as *vinayadhara*, employment of which would suggest a need for mastery of a Vinaya code in toto. Incidentally, although nothing of the sort is mentioned in this particular context, we also should remember our earlier hypothesis concerning the necessity that those fulfilling certain administrative functions know how to read and write, certainly not an entirely trivial qualification anywhere in the premodern world.

In addition to those explored above, there may be other avenues through which we may determine the responsibilities of certain monastic administrators.

49. Textual Materials 73.

In particular, we have begun to notice, at a number of points, terms the sense of which seems to be most generally understood simply as "administrator" or "manager." And we have likewise noted in some cases that what seems to be a specific term in one text is paralleled in nearly exactly the same context in another text, with however a different technical term in its place, this occasionally taking place even within the same textual tradition. We have assumed as a preliminary hypothesis that the usage of such terms is highly flexible, while keeping in mind the alternative possibility that we may also have to do with sectarian, regional, and/or chronological differences. One way to get at what may be unique about such terms and what may be generalizable is to explore the narrative contexts in which these words are employed. Many of these narrative contexts are of considerable intrinsic interest, emphasizing as they do the highly unfortunate karmic results of administrative misbehavior, malefeasance, and malefaction.

This page intentionally left blank

10

Misbehaving Managers

We have already seen in passing several examples from Buddhist narratives of administrators portrayed as engaging in illicit behaviors and suffering the karmic effects of such transgressions. Such stories constitute a virtual trope, especially in collections of narrative literature, many of which are historically related to the Vinaya corpora. These stories seem to concern a variety of administrative roles, mention an assortment of different titles, and assume a variety of possible transgressions.

As we have noticed repeatedly, the task of taking care of visiting monks is one specific role of a number of named administrative monks, including the *vaiyāpṛtyakara* and the *weínà*. There are a number of stories which seem to shed light on one ideology at work here. Examples are found in closely related forms in a number of texts, among which the version in the *Dafangbian fobaoen jing* 大方便佛報恩經 is attractive because, among other things, it is of reasonable length. It is therefore worth translating here in full, not only because it illustrates the responsibilities of an administrative official but also, incidentally, as an example of a type of scatological reference in Buddhist literature frequently glossed over. The story runs as follows:[1]

1. Textual Materials 74. The *Dafangbian fobaoen jing* is an interesting text which is found in Chinese, with a Tibetan translation made from the Chinese. There is some possibility that the

At that time the Blessed One and Ānanda entered Rājagṛha, and having begged alms again left the city. Outside the city gates there was a great, deep pit. In those days, the people of Rājagṛha would haul their urine and feces there, and dispose of them in that pit. When it would rain the runoff water[2] would also flow into it. At that time there was a worm in that cesspool, in form resembling a human being, but with many hands and feet. Gazing from a distance at the Tathāgata it raised its head from the water, and looking upon the Tathāgata tears flowed and filled its eyes. When the Tathāgata saw this he felt pity and was pained with sympathy, pained without feeling any joy. Then he returned to the Vulture Peak.

At that time, Ānanda spread the sitting mat and the Tathāgata sat down upon it, folding his legs into the lotus posture. Then Ānanda, thinking about many things, asked the Tathāgata: "Blessed One, in that place over there we saw a worm in a cesspool. What action did it commit in a former life? How long will it now spend being born into that water? And again, when will it attain liberation?"

The Buddha spoke to Ānanda and the assembly: "It is good that you should ask this question. I shall explain it to you. Ānanda, it goes back incalculable thousands of aeons into the past. At that time a Buddha had appeared in the world, and his teaching had flourished and spread. After he died and entered nirvāṇa, in the time of the Semblance Teaching, there was a brahmin, and he built a monastery and supported the monastic community. At one time there was a donor who presented a large amount of butter and oil. Then a [party of] visiting monks [*āgantuka*] arrived. At that time the administrative *weínà*[3] became very hateful. He despised the fact that a large

text was compiled in China from Indian materials; it is certain at least that parts of it were supplemented in China from preexisting translations, on which see Naitō 1955. Note the text's title in Tibetan: while the colophon gives only the translation *Thabs mkhas pa chen po sangs rgyas drin lan bsab pa zhes bya ba'i mdo*, the text opens with the following: *rgya'i* [S *rgya gar*] *skad du* | *de'i phāng byan* [S *bya ba*] *phhur po'u in kyeng su* [D *sū*] *phim de'i ir* [D *ayir*]. This is a transliteration not only of *Dàfāngbiàn fóbàoēn jīng* 大方便佛報恩經 (EMC daj^h puaŋ bjian^h but paw^h ʔən kɛjŋ), which is understandable, but also of the following reference to the first section of the text, *xùpǐn* 序品 zɨǝ̆' p^{h}im', and *dìyī* 第一 dɛj^h ʔjit, which suggests that the translators were not entirely sure of the extent of the title.

2. Chinese *èshuǐ* 惡水, "dirty water, sewage," but Tibetan *gru char gyi chu*, "light rain"?

3. Chinese *zhīshì weínà* 知事維那, rendered in Tibetan with *gang zag gi las gtsang sbyor byed pa*.

number of visiting monks had arrived. So he concealed the butter and oil, and would not give them out.

"The visiting monks said: 'Why do we not receive butter and oil and honey?' The *weínà* answered saying: 'You are visitors. I am the/an **āvāsika*.'[4] The visiting monks said: 'This is the donor's gift to the monks who are present now [**saṁmukhībhūta-saṁgha*].' Then the *weínà* got angry and scared, and reviled them saying: 'Why don't you take the shit and piss [to eat]? Why should you get butter and oil from me?' And from these evil words, for ninety billion aeons he was always born in this cesspool. The one who was the *weínà* at that time is now the worm in this cesspool. Through this one evil word, reviling the monastic community in a former life, for incalculable thousands of lives he dwells in the midst of shit."

This tale clarifies at least one of the tasks of this administrator, namely, the distribution of food to visiting monks. The monks suggest that their current residence in the monastery qualifies them to receive a portion of the donations previously offered by a benefactor. The **āvāsika* plainly believes that his status as resident entitles him to deny to the visitors what he takes to be his own, a position which the authors of the text find highly objectionable. And their concern is clearly widespread and even a cliché in such literature. The parallel versions of this same episode shine light on various problems. Probably one of the oldest versions of this story is found in the *Saṃyuktāgama*.[5] This version has the present punishment for the offender that he walk along with a copper cauldron filled with fire above his head, which then pours down (molten copper?) over his body. There is no reference to excrement, and the story gives no direct reason why the present punishment should be apposite, the text just mentioning that the administrative monk (*zhīshì bǐqiū* 知事比丘) refused food to the visitors. There seems to be no similarity posited between refusing food and being bathed in molten metal, and the designation of the monk as an administrator is nonspecific. In this context, we must also note a partially parallel version in the *Saṁyutta-Nikāya*.[6] In that episode, a man suffers the present punishment of having his body smeared with shit and eating shit because, in the

4. *Rǔ kè wǒ jiù* 汝客我舊. Less likely: "You are visitors; I have been here since long ago." Tibetan: *khyed ni mdron po | nged ni gza'/bza' yin no*. I have been unable to locate a contextually appropriate meaning for *gza'/bza'*.

5. T. 99 (526) (II) 138a1–11 (*juan* 19).

6. Feer 1884–1898: ii.259.10–18 (XIX.2, §12), equivalent to the Chinese found at T. 99 (526) (II) 137c19–29 (*juan* 19).

time of the Buddha Kāśyapa when he was a royal teacher and brahmin, he invited the community to a meal and served them shit. This miscreant was not a monk at all, which clearly illustrates one aspect of the formulaic nature of the story outline, which can be adapted for different contexts and needs.

In the *Karmaśataka* narrative collection, we find a longer version of the same story. In fact, a considerable stock of stories critical of the lapses of administrative monks is to be found in this collection, which is preserved only in Tibetan translation.[7] Although I cannot yet prove it, this text gives the strong impression of belonging to the Mūlasarvāstivādins. I have noticed 12 stories in this collection, from a total of 127 and therefore fully 10 percent, in which the story of the past explaining some present circumstances concerns the deeds of an administrative monk.[8] Most of these stories find their motivation in, as the lawyers would say, a monk's malfeasance, misfeasance, and nonfeasance in the exercise of his fiduciary responsibilities. In the bulk of these stories, the protagonist commits some reprehensible deed during the course of his administrative tenure, subsequently repents this misdeed, and therefore obtains a karmically mixed result. It is this resulting circumstance with which the stories begin, and in explanation of the present usually miserable condition of some creature, the Buddha explains the past actions which led to this result. The *Karmaśataka*'s version of the story we just saw in the *Dafangbian fobaoen jing* reads as follows:[9]

> Ānanda, in a time long past—in the time of the Buddha *Sarvavara—a certain householder came to have faith in the teaching of the Perfect Buddha *Sarvavara, took refuge, undertook the four teachings, and thinking: "I will abandon the household

7. Already in 1901, Feer gave a complete synopsis of this interesting collection; he also, according to Przyluski and Lalou 1936: 179n4, referring to Lalou 1931: 15, §88, produced a complete translation, which remains unpublished. Subsequent studies include Abe 1935; Przyluski and Lalou 1936; Okada 1994a, 1994b; and Iibuchi 1995, 1997, 1998, 1999.

No translator is recorded in the translation's colophon or in catalogs. However, as already noticed by Nobel 1944: xiii–xiv and n. 2 on the basis of Bu ston's *Chos 'byung* (Obermiller 1931–1932: II.186), the translation of the *Karmaśataka* is attributed to Mūlakośa (Nobel suggests °śoka) of Bran (blan?) ka and Jñānakumāra of Gnyags, in the time before Glang dar ma. Bu ston's text reads (Lokesh Chandra 1971: *ya* 125a4–5): *bran ka mu la ko sha dang gnyags dznyā na kumā ras mdo sde las brgya pa dang gser 'od dam pa gnyis bsgyur.* (The reference to Bu ston was also noted by Okada 1994b: 210–211, and n. 31, referring to a communication from Helmut Eimer.) The date of the translation is unknown; for some inconclusive considerations on the date of the *Karmaśataka* itself, see Iibuchi 1999: 55–56.

8. Stories 1, 2, 10, 12, 32, 38, 39, 41, 53, 65, 71, 73. Since I first located these stories by reading the synopsis of Feer 1901, it is possible that there are other examples I have overlooked.

9. Story 32 in the collection; Textual Materials 12. See below n. 12.

life and renounce the world in the teaching of the Perfect Buddha *Sarvavara," abandoned his household and renounced the world in the teaching of the Perfect Buddha *Sarvavara. Having renounced the world, he mastered the Tripiṭaka, and became a preacher endowed with coherent and fluent eloquence,[10] and possessing robes, food, bed, seats, and medicines, he thought: "Well, as one who has obtained what is to be obtained in the way of wealth and reputation, I should certainly serve my fellow practitioners [**sabrahmacārin*]," and he exhorted the donors and benefactors, and reverenced the Buddha, the teaching, and the monastic community.

At that time, a monastic community of 77,000, including some who were advanced and some still progressing in the teaching [**śaikṣāśaikṣa*], wanted permission to pass the rain retreat atop the Camel-hump Mountain. They thought: "I[11] shall appoint an administrator [**vaiyāpṛtyakara*], who can permit us to pass the rain retreat." Wondering who would be able to care for their monastic community, they thought: "This Tripiṭaka master is famous and very meritorious. Since he possesses food and drink, bedding, cushions and medicaments, we are pleased with him, and he will be our administrator, and permit us to pass the rain retreat." Approaching him, they said: "Venerable, our monastic community of 77,000 wants to pass the rain retreat atop Camel-hump Mountain. If you are able to act as administrator in accord with the teaching, you will make us happy, and we will be able to pass the rain retreat with your aid." The Tripiṭaka master replied: "Don't worry about it! I will provide all the requisites you need." Then as soon as they heard this, those monks went to the top of that mountain, and relying only on that Tripiṭaka master entered the rain retreat. Then the Tripiṭaka master thought: "If I must not cause trouble for so many monks, it will not do for them to live on poor [food], so I will go and exhort donors and benefactors, and thus provide the monastic community with all the requisites they require." In the morning he put on his undergarment and upper robe, took his begging bowl and set out for a city in the region.

10. Compare the stock phrase in the *Divyāvadāna* (Cowell and Neil 1886: 329.3–4, 7–8; 493.8, 15): *amī bhikṣavaḥ tripiṭā dharmakathikā yuktamuktapratibhānāḥ*.

11. The disgreement in number is in the original.

At that time, a boat-full of 500 merchants had returned from the sea, having accomplished their mission. At a spot not distant from that mountain they unloaded their cargo, and settling down the merchants saw the crowd of monks living atop that mountain. Seeing this, they were very happy. The administrative monk approached them, and when they saw him they said: "Venerable, where are you going?" The Tripiṭaka master said: "The 77,000 monks who live atop that mountain are passing the rain retreat in reliance on me. For their sake I am going to exhort donors and benefactors." The merchants said: "Venerable, we don't want you to be troubled at all. We want to provide all the requisities they need," and they gave him a large amount of cash. They said: "Venerable, from today on you shall provide all that the monks require, and if they ask for this cash, that's fine, and if they do not ask for it, or if they ask for more than this, we will provide that too. And at the time of the end of the rain retreat, we want to offer meals as well." When they had spoken thus, the administrator took the cash, and returned to the monastery. But when he looked at the cash, he grew greedy, and buried that cash in the ground. He served the monks with poor quality food and drink.

Later, those monks said to that administrator: "Venerable, we cannot live on this poor food and drink."

He said: "This is all I can do; I can't do more than that. If you cannot live on it, you must ask your donors and benefactors to help you live."

Then, as soon as they heard this, those monks said to those merchants, "Are you able to provide food and drink for 77,000 monks?"

The merchants said: "Venerables, we gave the noble administrator much cash, and we said that if that suffices, that is fine, and if it does not suffice, ask and we will provide more money. So we will ask him why he provides you with poor-quality food and drink."

The merchants approached the Tripiṭaka master, and said: "Venerable, did not we say that if this amount of money suffices, that is fine, and if it does not suffice, we will provide more money? Why do you give the monks poor food and drink?"

As soon as he heard this, the administrator was ashamed and angry, and thenceforth it was not fitting for him to act as administrator for those monks.

Then the monks said to him: "Venerable, since we entered the rain retreat relying on you, why don't you do anything at all? Don't you believe in providing the requisites for the monks any more?"

He became angry and said: "You only consume my own gifts of faith, while I am disgraced, so you should wallow in a cesspool, and eat shit and piss too!"

Then the monks thought: "This miserable one will be hurt and injured. If he had not used such horrible language toward the 77,000 [monks] advanced and still progressing in the teaching, it would still have been very damaging to him, and if he is hurt that is not good, so now we will say nothing at all." And so they said nothing at all. Later on, the Tripiṭaka master felt ashamed, and begged forgiveness from the monks. They said: "Even if we forgive you, your acts will still not be forgiven."

Monks, what do you think? At that time, the one who renounced the world in the teaching of the Perfect Buddha *Sarvavara and became a Tripiṭaka master was none other than the worm [whose appearance in the cesspool motivated the recitation of this past life story].

The first point of interest in this story is that a community of monks requires a **vaiyāpr̥tyakara* to serve it during the rain retreat. As we saw earlier, however, at least in the *Varṣāvastu* of the Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya, the *vaiyāpr̥tyakara* who is assigned to take care of the monks during their rain retreat should be the same type of *vaiyāpr̥tyakara* as that depicted in the Prātimokṣa's Niḥsargika 10, namely, a lay assistant, *ārāmika* or *upāsaka*.[12] Yet, the **vaiyāpr̥tyakara* selected in this story to look after the monks during the rain retreat is explicitly stated to be a monk, and moreover one who has mastered the Tripiṭaka, and hence he is quite clearly not a menial. His responsibilities seem to range widely, from feeding the monks to the financial management of donations they have received. From one point of view, it is hard to reconcile this directly with the defining distinction we are led to expect by Niḥsargika 10, in which the veritable raison d'être of the *vaiyāpr̥tyakara* is the monks' inability to directly handle money. The *vaiyāpr̥tyakara* in this account, although he is a monk, very explicitly does receive money—cash—from donors, and is pledged to keep it in trust for the monastic community, whose members are in retreat. The author(s) of this tale seem entirely

12. See above, p. 46.

unconcerned with any putative tension between monastic status and the handling of money. In this story, then, as far as fiscal stewardship is concerned, the monastic *vaiyāpṛtyakara* and the model we bring of the Prātimokṣa's lay *vaiyāpṛtyakara* seem to play identical roles.

Although there is probably no historical relation between it and the *Karmaśataka*, very close to the same story appears again in the so-called *Sūtra of the Wise and the Fool*.[13] There, the monastic community places a treasure for safekeeping with the *mómódì*, a title we studied in Chapter Eight.[14] When it comes time to ask for the treasure back, the one who requests it is the **sthavira-weínà* (*shàngzuò weínà* 上座維那). As pointed out by Lévi and Chavannes, for the *mómódì* of the Chinese text, the Tibetan translation has *las byed pa'i dge slong*, a term which we would expect to represent **karmakāraka bhikṣu*.[15] However, as has been known for over one hundred years, the Tibetan translation of the *Sūtra of the Wise and the Fool* was made directly from the Chinese text, and there exists no Indic version of this collection of stories. The text itself, moreover, is a Chinese compilation said to have been edited on the basis of stories heard in Khotan. It was compiled in Chinese in 445, and its Tibetan translation was made from Chinese in the early ninth century by 'Gos Chos grub (Facheng 法成).[16] Therefore, we must use these sources with the greatest of care; in no way can the Tibetan version be said to represent anything other than—the admittedly very knowledgeable—Chos grub's interpretation of the text and its terminology (as interesting as this may be, in its own way). In addition, given the way in which the text was compiled, we can be virtually certain that it does not represent a translation of an Indic text per se. Thus, we must content ourselves with reference to this text solely in a supportive role, as

13. T. 202 (IV) 443c26–444b17 (*juan* 13). For a version in English, see the translation of the Mongolian translation (itself from Tibetan, which is a translation from the Chinese) in Frye 1981: 242–243. (Note that, according to Naitō 1955: 314, the *Sūtra of the Wise and the Fool* is closely related to T. 156, *Dafangbian fobaoen jing* 大方便佛報恩經.)

14. T. 202 (IV) 444a23–27 (*juan* 13).

15. Lévi and Chavannes 1915: 218–219. The Tibetan may be found in Schmidt 1845: 320.5–6; S 281, *mdo sde, ci* 248b3–4. In the Tibetan translation, it is only the saṁgha which asks for the treasure to be returned, so there is no rendering of *shàngzuò weínà* 上座維那.

16. Given the history of this text in the modern West, it is surprising that we still have, as far as I know, no complete translation of the Chinese "original." There are a number of studies of interest, however, among which only a few references may be given here. More than 160 years ago, the Tibetan translation was edited and translated by Schmidt 1845, with corrections by Schiefner 1852. Subsequent studies include Takakusu 1901; Laufer 1916: 415–422; Matsumoto 1917 (with helpful tables); Fukui 1917; Lévi 1925; and Pelliot 1929: 256–263. Especially concerning Chos grub and the Tibetan translation, see Sada 1932; Takahashi 1962, 1963; Terjék 1969, 1970 (editions of Dunhuang fragments of the Tibetan translation); Ueyama 1967–1968/1978: 46–47; and with a few more details Ueyama 1990: 124–126; and Tamaki 1980.

an example of yet another parallel to the story we have seen presented in other texts with similar but distinct vocabulary.

Other stories in the same *Sūtra of the Wise and the Fool* also refer to administrators. In one case, a *yíngshì bǐqiū* 營事比丘 uses the possessions of the monastic community, its flowers, fruits, food, and drink, and gives them away to laypeople. For this, he is reborn in hell.[17] In another story, narrating a past life of Aṅgulimāla, it is recounted that he was a monk working in the fields on behalf of the community *weísēng zhíshì* 爲僧執事. He is called *zhíshì bǐqiū* 執事比丘, and his work referred to as *yíngsēngshì* 營僧事 [18]

The only story in the *Karmaśataka* collection in which an administrator plays a positive role is the tenth story of the collection,[19] in which the monk in question exhorts his parents, brahmins, and devout householders; donates to the monastic community rice, soup, gruel, clothing, and so on; and adorns the stūpas of the hair and nails (presumably, of the Buddha) with various garlands and the like, directing the merit from these activities toward a favorable future rebirth in a wealthy family. It is not at all clear, however, whether the donations mentioned are to be connected directly with his role as an administrator, or whether this is incidental to the story.

While it would require careful study of the entirety of the *Karmaśataka* to work out in detail its values and priorities,[20] even a cursory perusal of the text, and the fact that fully 10 percent of its stories concern administrative worthiness, suggest the authors' preoccupation with the issue. Despite the fact that when it speaks of administrative or managerial tasks the text mentions this almost always with verbal and nominal forms of *zhal ta byed pa*, which as a noun it might not be entirely reckless to suggest usually reflects the Sanskrit **vaiyāpr̥tyakara*, it is far from sure that this translates into a specific concern with a certain class of administrator. For this reason, and due to our lack of certainty concerning the underlying Indic vocabulary, I consider the evidence of these stories here, rather than having brought them into our earlier discussion of the *vaiyāpr̥tyakara*.

The accounts of past actions in these stories are, for the most part, formulaic. In explanation of a present circumstance, the Buddha informs those who inquire of the former birth of the protagonist, usually in the time of the

17. T. 202 (IV) 379a7–9 (*juan* 4). S 281, *mdo sde, ci* 77a6, and Schmidt 1845: 99.10: *dge 'dun gyi las byed pa'i dge slong*. Translated in Frye 1981: 77.

18. T. 202 (IV) 427c12–19 (*juan* 11). S 281, *mdo sde, ci* 203b5, 204a1, 2, and Schmidt 1845: 270.5, 11, 12: *las byed pa, las byed pa'i dge slong, dge 'dun gyi las bya ba*. Translated in Frye 1981: 195. Notice above p. 151 the reference to a *naivāsika* engaging in plowing.

19. Textual Materials 75.

20. Such studies are now being undertaken by Junko Matsumoto (née Iibuchi).

Buddha Kāśyapa. Sometimes, but not always, we find a short formula concerning the birth of that protagonist, who is then said to become a monk or nun, and who upon ordination undertakes service to the monastic community. After the core of the story containing, in all but the one case noted above, some objectionable behavior comes the repentance of the protagonist and a vow to obtain future liberation (*praṇidhāna*), usually as an arhat.

The first story in the *Karmaśataka* collection concerns the daughter of a family of Benares who, having faith in the Buddha Kāśyapa and receiving the permission of her parents, becomes a nun:[21]

> She mastered the Tripiṭaka, and became a preacher endowed with coherent and fluent eloquence, and possessing robes, food, bed, seats, and medicines, she thought: "Well, as one who has obtained what is to be obtained in the way of wealth and reputation, I should certainly serve my fellow practitioners [**sabrahmacāriṇī*]," and she undertook the administrative duties of the dual community in accord with the teachings [**dharmavaiyāpṛtyaṁ karoti*].[22] Later, some business came up, and when she made a request to several nuns, some advanced and some still progressing in the teaching [**śaikṣāśaikṣā*], they said: "We have devoted ourselves to the good cause [**kuśalapakṣa*]; we cannot [help you] accomplish your task."
>
> Then when she heard that, that nun became consumed by an extreme anger, and angrily she said to those nuns: "When I only feed and fill you as if you were dogs, is it impossible for you to offer even a single word for my benefit?"
>
> Then those nuns thought: "This miserable woman spoke and did injury to us, but it is not proper if, cycling in the world of transmigration, she will receive great suffering," and thinking that they need act as her friends, they said: "Do you know who I am and who you are?"
>
> She said: "I know; both you and I are renunciants."
>
> They said: "My lady, although we indeed resemble renunciants, while you are an ordinary being [**pṛthagjana* = non-arhat], bound by all the bonds, being those who have done what is to be done [**kṛtakṛtya*, i.e., arhats], we must explain the fault you have committed. Cycling in the world of transmigration, you will receive great suffering."

21. Textual Materials 76.
22. Cf. the expression above in p .53, n. 60.

> When she heard that, the nun became very repentant, and repenting greatly engaged even more in the administration of the dual monastic community in accord with the teaching.

The adminstrator in question here is a nun, a fact which, along with other evidence we have occasionally cited, suggests that, at least in this regard, the administrative structures of the monastic communities of nuns probably paralleled those of the monks on the whole. In this story, it seems that the nun's motivation for electing to undertake service is her own wealth; having a sufficient stock of material possessions, she chooses to serve others. It is not clarified here what her specific responsibilities are, other than apparently feeding the other nuns, but when she tries to delegate some task, those who are asked refuse. We may recall in this context the stipulations of the *Ratnarāśi*, for example, that practitioners are not to be asked by administrators to take on administrative tasks; it is probably some similar expectation that informs our story here. The authors of our text do not criticize the nun-administrator for asking for or expecting cooperation and assistance from others, however. Her transgression lies rather in her violent reaction to the rejection of her request. We are not told in so many words whether the rejection was proper, but the fact that some of those who rejected the request are said to be arhats, that is *aśaikṣā*, strongly suggests that the request itself was improper, which would fit well with the ideology expressed in the *Ratnarāśi*.

The second story in the *Karmaśataka* collection likewise occurs in the time of the Buddha Kāśyapa. A rich young man becomes a monk, learns the Tripiṭaka, and so on. Thinking to make himself useful:[23]

> [He] undertook the administration of the monastic community in accord with the teaching. Then, sometime later, it came time for a certain monk-arhat to have his turn as administrator in charge of the evening intermediate-beverages.[24] Then, after he had distributed the intermediate-beverages to the monastic community, his body fatigued, he went to his cell and sat, folding his legs in the meditation posture. Then, the administrator's benefactors wanted the intermediate-beverage, and they said to the other monks: "Whose turn is it to be the administrator of intermediate-beverages there?" They said: "It is the turn of such-and-such a monk." Then that

23. Textual Materials 77. This translation omits the first, stock paragraph of the text.
24. The expression here is *phyi dro'i gung skyems*.

> administrator [who was pointed out, although it was really the turn of another] was angry, and out of anger he shut an eye, saying: "He's looking like he's got this eye [that is, closed, thus he is seeing the wrong person]." When he said this, he went to where that arhat was and said: "Venerable, while I took care of the benefactors and donors on your behalf, and served them with all the requisites, you were enjoying my gifts of faith [**śraddhādeya*], snuggled and sleeping like a dog in his lair."
>
> Then the arhat thought: "This miserable one will be injured by these words, but it is not proper if, cycling in the world of transmigration, he will receive great suffering."

The administrative task highlighted here is that of distributing the monks' beverages during the late afternoon or evening. (We remember that, in accord with Vinaya teachings, monks are prohibited to eat after noon, but beverages are permitted.) In accord with a pattern we have seen elsewhere, the offended monk is an arhat, and the offender by implication, and according to the narrative flow of the story, a newly ordained and not much advanced monk. It is of some interest that the text explicitly states the task of distributing such evening beverages to be a rotating one; the monk in question complains because, although it is not his turn, the arhat who should be responsible for the task has retired for the evening, and he is pressed into service in his stead. This is one more piece of evidence in support of the hypothesis, suggested earlier, that such administrative posts are, if not always at least commonly, temporary and therefore rotating assignments.

Story 65 of the collection concerns a man who becomes an administrative monk in charge of drinking water.[25] While giving water to the monastic community with a water vase, a certain arhat-monk jostled him, and because of that contact the vase slipped from his hand and was broken. Angrily, the administrator said to the arhat: "You're like a bloated[26] ox who doesn't realize his own clumsiness!" The arhat heard those words of his, and taking him aside instructed him, saying: "Venerable, do you know who you are and who I am?" and so on. The title designating the monk in charge of drinking water, *dge*

25. Textual Materials 78.

26. I understand the text's *dir po* by reference to *ldir ba*, one meaning of which is "bulging, distended, fat." Tshe ring dbang rgyal (Bacot 1930: 90a3) offers *guḍaguḍa* as equivalent to *ldir*; Sanskrit *guḍaguḍāyana* (cf. *gulagula*) means a "rumbling in the belly" or the "rumble of thunder," which points to the (related?) sense of *ldir* as to "thunder, rumble."

slong chu'i zhal ta byed pa, undoubtedly represents the Sanskrit *pānīya-vārika*, as attested in the *Mahāvyutpatti* and elsewhere.

Another interesting tale of pure envy is found in story 71:[27]

> At the time of the Buddha Kāśyapa, in the town of Benares, there was a rich and wealthy man, with many and vast possessions, [and so on].[28] Later on he came to delight in the Buddha, delight in the teaching, and delight in the monastic community, took refuge, undertook the four teachings, and directly perceiving the fruit of the nonreturner he thought: "I have no son or daughter, and if after I die all of my possessions will escheat to the state, well, I will [instead] honor the Buddha, the teachings, and the monastic community [with those possessions]." He then built a monastery perfect in every way, and endowed it with all the requisites. Serving the monks with all the requisites, he appointed an administrative monk [**vaiyāpṛtyakara bhikṣu*] there.
>
> Then, somewhat later, that administrator had some business in the provinces, and after asking that householder [for permission], he left. After he had left, an arhat wandering the land came and arrived at that monastery. The householder saw him resplendent with his resplendent entourage, and immediately after seeing him the householder was very pleased, and thought: "If I would invite him alone, he would not assent, so on his behalf alone I will invite the whole monastic community to the house," and thinking to invite them to a meal, bowing to his feet he said: "Noble one, tomorrow, together with the community of monks, please come for a meal at my house."
>
> The arhat thought: "If I myself do not accept, this will impede the profit of these monks here, as well as impeding the merit of this donor," so he assented by remaining silent. Then the householder prepared at his house for the day after next[29] a ritually correct bath for the monks, cushions and mats, and with [an offering of] water sent an invitation to the monks. He exhorted them, saying: "Nobles, when it is your turn for dinner and a ritually correct bath, Nobles,

27. Textual Materials 79.

28. Compare the stock phrase found in the *Divyāvadāna*, *Avadānaśataka*, and elsewhere: *āḍhyo mahādhano mahābhogo vistīrṇaviśālaparigraho vaiśravaṇadhanasamudito vaiśravaṇadhanapratispardhī*, on which see Hiraoka 2002: 154–155 (2.A); I have abbreviated the opening sentences.

29. The text seems slightly confused about the timing of the visit, as it is also inconsistent in the number of individuals, fluctuating between singular and plural forms.

> just then please know your turn at that time." The monks assembled at his house, and the householder summoned the barber. He had him cut the monks' hair, and had them bathe in a ritually correct bath, and with his own hands he satisfied them with pure and excellent food and drink.
>
> The administrative monk, having accomplished his task in the country, came back to the monastery. Once back there, not seeing the monks, he asked where they had gone. They[30] said: "They were invited by the householder to his house."
>
> He said: "On whose account were they invited?"
>
> They said: "They were invited on account of a monk who newly arrived."
>
> Immediately upon hearing this, [the administrator] became exceedingly unhappy. He thought: "I'm the one who takes care of all of his affairs. Yet [the householder] invited the community of monks on account of some newly arrived monk," and becoming angry he went to the house of that householder. Arriving there he looked around, and saw the householder himself respectfully serving the arhat. Then he got even angrier out of envy.
>
> When the monks returned to the monastery from the meal, he approached the arhat and said: "Venerable, do you know who this householder is who acts in this way?"
>
> The arhat said: "I know; he is a nonreturner [**anāgāmin*]."
>
> The administrator said: "If that is so, rather than interesting yourself in the barber it would be preferable for you to pluck your hair out. Rather than taking a bath and accepting the requisites, it would be preferable for you to sink into a cesspool. Rather than for you to accept food and drink, it would be preferable for you to eat shit and drink piss."
>
> The arhat thought: "This miserable one will be injured by these words [and so on]."

The **vaiyāpṛtyakara* here plainly carries out some affairs on behalf of the lay owner of the monastery, its *vihārasvāmin*, including duties which take him away from the monastery. But the nature of those responsibilities is nowhere specified. Moreover, we note that this **vaiyāpṛtyakara* is appointed by the lay owner of the monastery, rather than by the monks of the community. It is

30. As so often in this literature, the pronoun remains maddeningly unspecified.

interesting that we are able to cite a number of extremely close parallels to this story. Already in his study of the *Karmaśataka*, Feer had noticed the relation of this story to one in the *Avadānaśataka*, shorter but representing very much the same narrative:[31]

> [The Buddha Krakucchanda] approached the royal capital of Śobhāvatī and dwelt there. A certain householder had constructed a monastery in that royal capital, where monks from different localities felt free to come and go [at will]. There was an ordinary [*pṛthagjana*] monk, a *naivāsika* resident in that monastery. He was exceedingly jealous of his residence, and seeing visiting monks [*āgantuka*] he would revile them, become angry with them, show them ill will, become upset with them, and get furious with them. But when he saw those monks leave the monastery he was filled with joy and happiness, and he would go out and insult them [as they left].
>
> At one time an arhat-monk arrived from the countryside. Now, the owner of the monastery [*vihārasvāmin*] was a nonreturner [*anāgāmin*], and he recognized that this was an arhat by his deportment. He was delighted and invited him, along with the community of monks, for the next day to a meal and a bath in the bath house. Now, the *āvāsika* monk was not there then.[32] When the second bath had been made ready and the meal prepared, the *āvāsika* monk arrived. He too entered the bath house, and saw the owner of the monastery, clad only in a single piece of cloth, engaged in perfuming the visiting monk. And he became jealous. Then, with a malicious intent he uttered the following harsh words: "It would be better for you, monk, to smear your body with shit than to appropriate the service of such a benefactor!"
>
> The arhat remained silent and tolerant in the face of this, and thought to himself: "I'm afraid that this ascetic will suffer grievously for this action!" When the time came then for a general meeting of the community, the *naivāsika* monk heard the arhat say, "You had a

31. Textual Materials 54. Translated in Feer 1891: 193. Apparently, the same story also appears in the unpublished *Aśokāvadānamālā*, No. 17 (Feer 1891: xxvii).

The corresponding Chinese version appears to label the guilty monk as **vihārasvāmin*, in charge of administering the affairs of the community, *sìzhǔ yíng* [*guǎn*] *lǐ sēngshì* 寺主營 [or 管] 理僧事, but this Chinese expression is far from clear, and the story's ending is also rather different. Further study is required.

32. The Sanskrit and Tibetan simply say this. The Chinese translation says that he had other business and was not there, as we understand from the *Karmaśataka* version as well.

> malicious intent," and hearing this he became remorseful. He fell at the feet of the arhat, and said: "Forgive me, Noble one, for having uttered unkind words to you!"

Here, in the place of the *Karmaśataka*'s **vaiyāpṛtyakara*, we have *āvāsika/naivāsika*, terms which are sometimes distinguished but, as we noted earlier in our consideration of this vocabulary, may also, as here, apparently be used interchangeably. Moreover, the particular duties of this *āvāsika*, if any, are not specified. Nor are they made clear in the further parallels to this same story in the Pāli *Jātaka* and *Petavatthu*.[33] The version of this story in the latter text runs as follows: a man builds a monastery for a monk attached to his family. Visiting monks come from all around and are treated with hospitality. The resident *āvāsika* monk becomes jealous, and speaks ill to the patron of the visitors, at which the patron insults them all. Both patron and resident die and are reborn as hungry ghosts (*peta*). Regarding the resident monk, the patron says:[34] "I had one *āvāsika* in continual residence in the monastery I built at the monastic compound." The former patron now eats shit, and stands atop the former monk, who in turn consumes as his food the shit of his former patron. The commentary explains that the patron's insult which resulted in this karmic fruit was his saying to the visiting monks:[35] "It is better for you to eat shit than to enjoy that food [I provided as alms]."

Other interesting variations on the same basic theme are found in the Chinese **Aśokarājāvadāna* and **Aśokarājasūtra*.[36] There, it is recounted that in an outcaste (*caṇḍāla*) village in Mathurā, Upagupta and another monk saw a young boy covered in abscesses, which in turn were filled with parasites. Why, asks the monk, is this child, who Upagupta has informed him is a *srotaāpanna*, suffering so? In a former life, the child was a *weínà* in the meditation chamber(?) (*chánfáng* 禪房), and he verbally attacked an arhat-monk who was ill there with abscesses, urging him to leave and go to a *caṇḍāla* village. He repented, however, which accounts for his present *srotaāpanna* status, a classic

33. Pāli *Jātaka* 41 and *Petavatthu* 43 (IV.8), *Gūthakhādaka-petavatthu* (identical with 44, except for the gender of the protagonist). For the latter, see Hardy 1894: 266.18–269.5, and Ba Kyaw and Masefield 1980: 277–279. The parallels were pointed out by Feer 1891: 195.

34. *Mayham āvāse mayā katavihāre eko bhikkhu āvāsiko nibaddhavasanako ahosi*. For the technical sense of *āvāsa*, see Hu-von Hinüber 1994: 189–190, and Kieffer-Pülz 1992: 42–44.

35. *Āhāraparibhogato varaṁ tumhākaṁ gūthakhādanan ti akkosi*.

36. T. 2042 (L) 124a4–18 (*juan* 6) and 2043 (L) 166b2–29 (*juan* 10), trans. Przyluski 1923: 385–386; Li 1993: 168.

example of mixed karmic results.[37] Similar episodes are found in the Chinese *Saṁgharakṣitāvadāna*:[38]

> In the time of the Buddha Kāśyapa there was a monk who was a **vihārasvāmin* [*sēngsìzhǔ* 僧寺主], in charge of the management of internal and external affairs [*diǎn neìwài shìshì jiǎnjiào* 典内外事事撿挍]. But he did not admonish the disciples, and the young monks did not strike the *gaṇḍī* according to the rule. The Vinaya masters then said: "**Vihārasvāmin*, why do you cause them to ring the *gaṇḍī* and assemble the monastic community at an inappropriate time?" The monk replied, "I will take care of the management of the monastic community [*yíngsēngshì* 營僧事], a very hard job. You monks are just like sheep, only eating and sleeping. Why don't you strike [the *gaṇḍī*] yourselves?" And for this reason, he was reborn in hell as a sheep, tormented by fire and in pain, until at present he cannot rest.

In another story from the same text, a monk who holds the same administrative title appropriates for himself and his friends the best sleeping quarters, not following the precepts but acting according to his own whim, and not treating all equally. He also ends up in the appropriate hell.[39] It is odd to notice in these stories that what seems to be a translation of *vihārasvāmin*, *sìzhǔ* 寺主, is applied to administrative monks, although as we saw in our discussion of **karmadāna*, for instance, the same Chinese term sometimes appears to represent this latter term. The problem rests unresolved. Other terminology also appears in the context of sometimes even casual mention of administrators who violate some standard. In *Śākyaprabha's *Āryamūlasarvāstivādiśrāmaṇerakārikāvṛttiprabhāvatī*, for instance, we find mention of the type of violation attributable to a **naivāsika* monk who had the intention to steal from the monastic community, but did not do so.[40]

Some of the stories just mentioned refer more to ordinary moral failings than to fiduciary irresponsibility. But stories of the latter type are probably more interesting for our present purposes. In story 38 of the *Karmaśataka*,[41] a monk, undertaking administration, takes the goods destined for those monks

37. Almost identical are T. 2042 (L) 124b25–c10 (*juan* 6) and 2043 (L) 167a21–b15 (*juan* 10), trans. Przyluski 1923: 388–389; Li 1993: 172.

38. Textual Materials 80.

39. T. 749 (XVII) 570a4–8.

40. Textual Materials 56: "The text is from the [*Vinaya*] *Vibhaṅga*: A certain **naivāsika* monk roamed from place to place with the idea to steal the goods of the monastic community of the four quarters, and then felt regret. The Blessed One said: There is no *pārājika* offence; it is a *duṣkṛta*."

41. Textual Materials 81.

undergoing the rain retreat and gives them to those undergoing the winter retreat, and vice versa, also taking goods from both for himself, and to give to others. This results in his rebirth as a hungry ghost (*preta*), with the upper and lower halves of his body undergoing different tortures. In the next story,[42] a monk similarly enjoys by himself the wealth of the monastic community and the stūpa, what is provided for the continuous support of the monks,[43] and the wealth of the universal community of the four quarters, and gives it to others. Very shortly thereafter, in story 41,[44] a man, becoming an administrative monk, makes use as a single individual of the wealth of the monastic community and so on, and hoards it. Later, when he is struck by illness, he gives that wealth to his relatives. After the monks see that and stop him, he thinks: "If they're going to stop me, I'll make it so that [the wealth] won't be of any use to them at all, nor of any use to me either." Then out of anger he burns all of his (ill-gotten) wealth. Later he dies, and after death is reborn as a hungry ghost. Finally, in story 53, a man becomes an administrative monk, but is very busy socializing with others (**saṁsarga*). For that reason, he becomes undisciplined (**duḥśīla*).[45] Therefore, he is unable to deal properly with the wealth of the monastic community and so on, makes use of it as he pleases (**yathāsukham*), and even gives it to others. He is thus reborn 500 times as a hungry ghost. Similar stories can, of course, be found elsewhere.[46] One theme we might, finally, notice in the *Karmaśataka* is that of the merit produced by service being dedicated to good future rebirths. This formulaic dedication is paralleled in some other stories by the dedication of merit acquired through the practice of celibacy (*brahamcarya*).[47]

In addition to general references to fiscal irresponsibility, one of the most prominent themes we see in such stories is disrespect for visiting monks. This is an absolutely crucial point. This is so because the attitude one takes to visiting monks is the unique and vital indicator of one's attitude toward the very notion of the universal Buddhist church, the so-called monastic community of the four quarters. Failure to treat equally local and visiting monks sharply and directly betrays any claim to the universality of the Buddhist

42. Story 39, Textual Materials 82.

43. Tibetan *'tsho ba nar ma* almost certainly renders Sanskrit *dhruva-bhikṣā*. For a discussion of the term, see the Supplementary Note.

44. Textual Materials 83.

45. Textual Materials 84.

46. For example, a story in a Chinese compilation called *Jinglü yixiang* 經律異相 (T. 2121 [LIII] 258a16–b7 [*juan* 48], trans. Chavannes 1910–1911: III.283–284), has a **vihārasvāmin* (*sízhǔ* 寺主) steal a gift of pearls which pious merchants have entrusted to him as a gift to the community. When pressed, he says, "They [the pearls] were given to me. If you want to grab them away from me, I'll just give shit to you! If you don't get out of here now, I'll slice off your hands and feet and throw you into a cesspool."

47. See Iibuchi 1995.

community, and therefore more profoundly any belief in "Buddhism" as such. If the local were to be what counts most, as favoritism toward resident monks would indicate, the basic ideology of Buddhism as a tradition of equality would be rejected. It is only the equal treatment of *all* members of the monastic community, regardless of their affiliation, that allows the Buddhist church to think of itself as a unity and, in this sense, at least from the point of view of the monastic authors of our texts, for there to be something generalizable as "Buddhism" at all. This, then, is the fundamental basis of the deep concern our narrative texts show over the behavior of those who are responsible for looking after the hospitality offered to visitors. These administrators' betrayal of their charge reflects not only on them as individuals, or on their local community, potentially affecting the patronage shown it by the laity, but more far reachingly, it reflects on the viability of the Buddhist church as a corporate entity. This particular concern with the rectitude of those administrators responsible for the hospitality offered to monastic colleagues suggests that, alongside the standpoint of several of the materials we examined in Chapter Two of this study, which (at least appear to) devalue administration, some authors indeed had a strong sense of the vital role that administrators played in the maintenance of the Buddhist church as a whole, without which there would be no opportunity for those who specialize in meditation and scholarship to carry out their vocations.

Like the passages quoted above, but in an opposite way, a passage found in the Mahāsāṁghika Vinaya may also require for its proper understanding an awareness of this concern over the moral qualities of administrative monks.[48] The text contains a discussion of stūpas and those for whom their construction is allowed. In addition to the list of the spiritual elite, *tathāgata*, *śrāvaka*, *pratyekabuddha*, *cakravartin*, *srotaāpanna*, *sakṛdāgāmin*, *anāgāmin*, and *arhat*, the text goes on:[49]

> 若言持律、若言法師、若言營事徳望比丘、應語長老。是人持戒賢善。
> 多供養僧、執事有勞。應與起塔.

We might render this:

> Some say **vinayadharas*, some dharma preachers [**dharmabhāṇaka*, **dharmakathika*?], and some *yíngshì déwàng bǐqiū* 營事徳望比丘

48. T. 1425 (XXII) 444b7–27 (*juan* 27). We know that this section is called *vihāravastupratisaṁyuktam* from the reference in the *Bhikṣu-prakīrṇaka*, Roth 1970: 329.3–4, §294, No. 31. The section covers 444a25–445a4 in the Taishō edition.

49. T. 1425 (XXII) 444b22–23 (*juan* 27).

> [virtuous administrative monks?] should be referred to as Venerable [*zhǎnglǎo* 長老].[50] These people uphold the discipline [**śīlavat*] and are worthy and good. Providing great material support to the monastic community, administrators [*zhíshì* 執事] make tremendous efforts; they should be given a stūpa.

While it might be possible to interpret this passage as a reference to the high status of this "administrative monk," it seems to me at least equally possible that we can read it in light of concerns about the moral status of such monks. If we read the passage with this in mind, it may be understood to say that administrative monks who maintain their high morality are assured of a high status, although participation in administrative undertakings in and of itself does not offer this assurance.

Two terms are of special interest to us here: *yíngshì déwàng bǐqiū* 營事德望比丘 and *zhíshì* 執事. The latter we recall as a standard equivalent of *vaiyāpṛtyakara* in the Chinese translations of the Prātimokṣas. The former is somewhat more problematic, but *yíngshì* 營事 at least we remember as the translation of *vaiyāpṛtyakara* in the *Ratnarāśi* and elsewhere. Since it seems most likely that these two terms should be understood to refer to the same individual, it is most plausible that this individual was indeed called *vaiyāpṛtyakara*. But the problem does not end there. Long ago, Louis de La Vallée Poussin, following an entry in Oda's dictionary, discussed this Mahāsāṁghika Vinaya passage, indirectly however, based on its quotation in a Chinese text, Fazang's 法藏 (643–712) commentary on the *Avataṁsaka sūtra*, *Huayanjing tanxuan ji* 華嚴經探玄記.[51] Unfortunately, the citation in the *Avataṁsaka* commentary is, at best, misleading. Oda's dictionary has, consequently, misconstrued the division of terms (that is, from the point of view of the Vinaya text itself, although Oda's reading is true to Fazang's quotation), and this, in its turn, led La Vallée Poussin to reconstruct (wrongly) the last portion of the list of monks allowed stūpas as "Vinayadharadharmācārya, Vaiyāpṛtyabhikṣu, and the virtuous monk."[52] What the *Avataṁsaka* commentary actually says (without inserting punctuation in the problematic phrase) is 又依僧祇律。有凡僧亦起塔。謂持律法師營事比丘德望比丘應起塔. One would naturally understand, then, as Oda and following him La Vallée Poussin, did: *chílǜ fǎshī* 持律法師, *yíngshì bǐqiū* 營事比丘, and *déwàng bǐqiū* 德望比丘. It would be possible to divide *chílǜ* 持律 and *fǎshī* 法師,

50. See May 1979.

51. La Vallée Poussin 1937: 288, referring to Oda 1917: 1114a. Fazang's text is T. 1733 (XXXV) 262b19–20 (*juan* 8).

52. La Vallée Poussin (1937: 288nn3, 4) credits Wogihara with the latter two interpretations.

but in any case *yíngshì bǐqiū* 營事比丘 and *déwàng bǐqiū* 德望比丘 are clearly to be distinguished. The original text of the Mahāsāṁghika Vinaya itself, however, equally clearly separates *chílǜ* 持律, *fǎshī* 法師, and *yíngshì déwàng bǐqiū* 營事德望比丘. It is interesting to note that the same passage had already been quoted in its variant form by Daoxuan 道宣 (596–667) in his extensive Vinaya commentary, *Sifenlü shanfan buque xingshi chao* 四分律刪繁補闕行事鈔,[53] though I cannot say whether Daoxuan's text might have been Fazang's source. It is not certain that the Vinaya text is really to be understood as I have proposed, with the accompanying implication that administrative monks must demonstrate merit in order to qualify for the honor of a stūpa upon death. But what is clear is that the dissociation of titles of the administrative monk and the virtuous monk that we find in the *Avataṁsaka* commentary is a secondary (or, if we consider the Chinese translation of the Indic Mahāsāṁghika Vinaya itself as secondary, a tertiary) misunderstanding of some original Indian material.

We have seen here, as we have already noticed repeatedly, the difficulties we confront when we attempt to understand an Indian technical vocabulary through Chinese translations. Despite the severe drawbacks, we have been able to identify some general patterns, and in this light a bit more information might also be worth examining in this respect.

53. T. 1804 (XL) 145c2–3 (*juan xia* 4): 僧祇。持律、法師、營事比丘、德望比丘、應起塔.

11

Chinese Terminology and Additional Indian Terms

A number of passages extant only in Chinese translations of Indian texts discuss what we are forced—perhaps only because of our ignorance of the full range of meaning of the terms—to understand as generically titled “administrators.” Encylopedias have offered lists of such terms which include the following:[1] *zhīshì* 知事, *zhīshìrén* 知事人, *zhīsēngshì* 知僧事, *zhīshìsēng* 知事僧, *zhīshì bǐqiū* 知事比丘, *zhīyuànshì* 知院事, *yíngshì bǐqiū* 營事比丘, *shoùshì* 授事, and *rènshì* 任事. We are usually entirely unable to associate this terminology systematically and with confidence with any specific Indic vocabulary, the investigation of which has been the central focus of our study. A brief look at some passages which contain such Chinese terms, however, like our examination of passages in Tibetan which we likewise cannot associate with Indic terminology in an altogether firm way, will nevertheless be a useful complement to our more

1. A study is dedicated to the term *chiji* 知事 in Mochizuki 1932–1936: 3583a–3584c. Largely based upon this, although without any mention of Mochizuki, is Gernet 1967. See also Mochizuki 1932–1936: 3073c–3074c, s.v. *sōshoku* 僧職, on monastic offices, mostly in Japan, and 2254b–2255a s.v. *shūji* 執事 (more generally read: *shitsuji*), on the term regularly used to translate *vaiyāpr̥tyakara* (and cf. Matsuda 1983b).

Oddly, the technical sense of the important word *zhī* 知 appears to have been misunderstood by Bapat and Hirakawa 1970: 263–264, who, rendering the Chinese *Samantapāsādikā* (T. 1462 [XXIV] [*juan* 9]), translated it by “intelligent” or “clever” in expressions such as *zhīdiǎnbōkù bǐqiū* 知典鉢庫比丘 (738b16–17); *zhībōkù bǐqiū* 知鉢庫比丘 (738b28, 738c1); *zhīkù bǐqiū* 知庫比丘 (738c6–7)—but at 738c10, *zhīshìshǐ* 知事使 is translated as “attendant.” In Pāli, the *Samantapāsādikā* (Takakusu and Nagai 1924–1947: 356–358) has here only *bhaṇḍāgārika*.

strictly Indological investigation. For despite our inability to precisely locate or identify these translation equivalents, the patterns we recognize in their use fully conform to those we have seen with more precisely definable Indic vocabulary.

In the Sarvāstivāda Vinaya, we learn that *zhīshìrén* 知事人 should not be appointed for minor tasks, but only for big jobs,[2] while in the **Sarvāstivāda Vinayamātṛkā*, it is stated that since the group-of-six (trouble-making) monks were the administrators (*zhīshì* 知事), they had not repaired the monastery, and it had fallen into disrepair.[3] In the Mahīśāsaka Vinaya,[4] Sudatta (Anāthapiṇḍada) donates a residence for the rain retreat, and wants to select a monk to administer it (*yuànchaī yī bǐqiū weì jīngyíng zhī* 願差一比丘爲經營之). The Buddha asks him whom he would like, and he replies that he would like Śāriputra, whom the Buddha then quickly sends.[5] (While recalling the passages which suggest that it was a *vaiyāpṛtyakara* who assisted in the rain retreat, we cannot be sure of the applicability of those references to this passage.)

In the Mahāsāṁghika Vinaya, we find a number of composite terms of uncertain value, including *zhíyuè weínà* 直月維那,[6] *zhíyuè weínà zhūzhīshìrén* 直月維那諸知事人,[7] *weínà zhīshì* 維那知事,[8] and *weínà zhíyuè* 維那直月.[9] All of these appear to be variants on, or compounds including, the term *weínà*, which we studied earlier. All except the third seem to suggest that the *weínà* in question was appointed for the month, a reference which reminds us of the Indic *māsa-vārika*, which we know from the *Abhisamācārika*, a portion of the Mahāsāṁghika (Lokottaravāda) Vinaya. Unfortunately, we have no good idea how such compound terms should be interpreted in an Indian context, if indeed they should be at all. The distance between the extant Indic text of the *Abhisamācārika* and the Chinese Mahāsāṁghika Vinaya cannot but make us wonder how closely related are the Chinese translation and its putative Indic prototype. Another text, the *Dabiqiu sanqian weiyi* 大比丘三千威儀, also discussed above, lists twenty-five rules for the *yíngshì weínà* 營事維那 in the dining

2. T. 1435 (XXIII) 247c24–248a6 (*juan* 34).

3. T. 1441 (XXIII) 600a16–26 (*juan* 6). See Clarke 2004: 85, 86n32, and 91n61, suggesting the possibility that the text is, in fact, Mūlasarvāstivādin.

4. T. 1421 (XXII) 167a10–16 (*juan* 25).

5. The same episode occurs in all extant Vinayas, although elsewhere without the technical term. For a comparative study, see Iwata 2004.

6. T. 1425 (XXII) 355a29 (*juan* 16).

7. T. 1425 (XXII) 356a27 (*juan* 16).

8. T. 1425 (XXII) 382b24 (*juan* 19).

9. T. 1425 (XXII) 459a29 (*juan* 28).

hall.[10] There are, of course, other Chinese terms which are even less surely to be associated with Indic terminology; investigation of such vocabulary must await another occasion.

We should, by now, not be surprised to notice that Indian texts provide us with additional examples of terms not so far noticed in compendia or dictionaries. Some of these seem like variant forms of known titles, while others are new. The *Śayanāsanavastu* of the Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya contains a reference to monks who are assigned to take care of the guard dogs of the monastery (*kukkurapoṣaka*),[11] and the Sanskrit text of the same *Śayanāsanavastu* also preserves the form *śayanāsanoddeśaka bhikṣu*, which interestingly appears in the plural.[12] The same form is found, again in Sanskrit, in the *Kośambakavastu* as well,[13] where Ānanda is identified as fulfilling this role, while in the Mahāsāṁghika *Bhikṣuṇī Vinaya*, we find the form *śayanāsanoddeśa*.[14] The *Varṣāvastu* for its part refers to a monk responsible for the bedding during the rain retreat, but with a term different from those usually found, *śayanāsana-grāhaka bhikṣu*,[15] which is parallel to the Pāli *senāsana-gāhāpaka*. Certainly, such examples could be multiplied.

A few other Indic terms might also be mentioned here, since although some references to what seem plainly to be administrative titles or terms are intriguing, we simply lack even the basic knowledge necessary to make sense of them or to place them within a broader context. For instance, a ninth- or tenth-century inscription from near Patna records, inter alia, the fact that a certain Vīradeva was permanently appointed to govern (protect? *paripālana*)

10. T. 1470 (XXIV) 922b1–c16 (*juan xia*).

11. Gnoli 1978a: 38.30, noted by Schopen 1998: 168n43. The Tibetan translation (D 1, *'dul ba, ga* 212b4; S 1, *'dul ba, ga* 288a3) has *dge slong khyi srel ba*. Commenting on the *Vinayasūtra* (Sankrityayana 1981: 111.7 [§17.2.40]: *dhārayed āraṇyakaṣ kukkaram*; D 4117, *'dul ba, wu* 92b7: *dgon pa pas khyi bcan bar bya'o*), Guṇaprabha uses the term *khyi 'chang ba po* (D 4119, *'dul ba, zu* 250a2).

Schopen 2001: 117 notes together with *kukkura-poṣaka* at Gnoli 1978a: 47.18 *uddeśadāyaka*, which he translates "the Monk Who Gives the Explanations." I wonder, however, whether this is really to be understood similarly as an administrative title. One strong argument that it should is, as Schopen notes, the use of this term with the formula *āsamudācārikaṁ dharmaṁ prajñapayiṣyāmi* which, says Schopen, is "promulgated not for all monks, but always for specific and limited categories of monks or monks who find themselves with a particular, often temporary, formal ecclesiastical status." See also Schopen 2000b: 150nII.31 for the relation of the formula to temporary administrative appointments.

12. Gnoli 1978a: 40.3, translated in D 1, *'dul ba, ga* 213a4; S 1, *'dul ba, ga* 288b7: *gnal mal 'gyed pa'i dge slong*.

13. Dutt 1939–1959: ii.190.4–5, and Raghu Vira and Lokesh Chandra 1974: folio 284b1 (880), translated in D 1, *'dul ba, ga* 131a5; S 1, *'dul ba, ga* 175b5: *gnal mal 'gyed pa*.

14. Roth 1970: 287.1, §248, 9B.1.

15. Dutt 1939–1959: iv.135.3, manuscript reproduced in Raghu Vira and Lokesh Chandra 1974: folio 75a2, and following a number of times. Translated in Tibetan in D 1, *'dul ba, ka* 239a3; S 1, *'dul ba, ka* 339b7: *gnas mal stobs pa'i dge slong*; and in Chinese at T. 1445 (XXIII) 1041b21: *fēnwòjù bìchù* 分臥具苾芻.

the monastery of Nālandā by the *saṁgha-sthiti*.[16] Not only do we not know what *paripālana* might have meant (although its literal meaning of "protecting" or "guarding" is clear enough), we do not even know what the word *saṁgha-sthiti* itself means.[17] It is similarly not clear what the exact status is of those whom Nāgārjuna in his *Ratnāvalī* urges a king to appoint as *dharmādhikr̥ta* ("religious administrator") with respect to the administration of all religious matters (*sarvadharmādhikāra*),[18] but there is no need to understand this role as a monastic one. We also find several Nālandā sealings with the term *dharmādhikaraṇa*,[19] but again there is little evidence of the precise meaning of the term.[20]

16. Kielhorn 1888; Sastri 1942: 89–91; Tsukamoto 1996: 166–168 (Ghosrāwā 1); Shizutani 1979: Pāla 13. Line 11: *nālandāparipālanāya niyataḥ saṅghasthiter yaḥ sthitaḥ*, and ll. 12–13: *nālandayā ca paripālitayeha satyā śrīmadvihāraparihāravibhūṣitāṅgyā | udbhāṣito pi vahukīrttivandhūpatitve yaḥ*. There are a number of obscurities in the passage, but most relevant for us is the precise meaning of *paripālana*. Not much help is given by Banerji 1948.

17. Note that in Kṣemendra's eleventh-century *Narmamālā*, there is repeated reference (I.55, 61, 74, 80, 85, 88, 96; II.98; III.90) to the *paripālaka* of a (Hindu) temple; see Baldissera 2005: 5, 52, with n. 62. It is understood by the translator generically as "superintendent." In this satire, the avarice and thievery of the *paripālaka* is emphasized. The text certainly implies that he has some control over the finances of the temple.

18. *Ratnāvalī* IV.22 (Hahn 1982: 100). The relevant terms are not commented upon by Ajitamitra (Okada 1990). The Chinese translation at T. 1656 (XXXII) 500c10 has *qìnlìrén* 勤力人.

19. Sastri 1942: 53, S. I, 669, 785: *dharmma-ādhikaraṇasya*; S. I, 644: *Śrī-Śīlāditya-dharmmādhikaraṇe*. Parallel sealings also from Nālandā may suggest that the term is not to be taken as a monastic one.

20. Although I would in no way suggest an equation of the terms, this word does remind us of the Aśokan *dhammamātā*, whose functions and status remain, unfortunately, also far from clear, although it does seem certain that these officials were royal officers and were not part of the monastic administration as such. See Norman 1982: 315–317=1991: 228–230.

12

The Administered

Any full and contextualized examination of the general issue of monastic administration must, of course, take cognizance not only of the administrators, but also of the administered. Here, even more than in the former case, research is lacking, although some materials certainly exist. For the moment, I shall restrict myself to some brief references to terms for those who might vaguely be considered "staff," leaving a full investigation to another occasion.[1] We noticed earlier that, in some literary contexts, the *vaiyāpṛtyakara*, along with the *ārāmika* and the *kalpikāraka*, are monastic servants or staff of a sort. Here, I will discuss several other terms which occur in inscriptions.

In a number of Maitraka grants from Valabhī dating from the beginning of the seventh to the beginning of the eighth centuries, we see provision being made for the maintenance of the monastery and the support of its servants (*pādamūla*).[2] We find variants of the stock expressions "for the repair of breaks and damage to the *devakula*, and for the maintenance of the servants," with provision

1. I am engaged in a large-scale project on slavery in Indian Buddhism, which will address one particular aspect of the broader issue. See already in this regard Schopen 1994b, and Silk 1992.

2. The term has been noticed a number of times. See early on Kielhorn 1898, who already noticed the correlation of the inscriptional term with instances in the Pāli *Jātaka*, citing Fausbøll 1877–1896: i.438.11, ii.328.13–14, iii.417.3, vi.401.10, as well as related compounds at i.122.4–5 (*pādamūlikapurisa*), i.439.3 (*dovarikapādamūlika*), ii.87.17, and v.128.18 (*rājapādamūlika*).

being made also for the repair of the *gandhakuṭī*, or of the monastery in general.[3] Once, we find the provision being extended to include *kalpikāras* as well.[4] In several grants, it is possible, but not certain, that these servants are stated to belong to the monastery.[5]

This reference to *pādamūla*, although not common in Buddhist inscriptions, is not limited to Valabhī. In a grant of Śivakaradeva III, one of the Bhauma kings of Orissa, the dating of which is controversial,[6] we find a donation made partially for food and clothing for servants (*pādamūla*) at the monastery and partly for the upkeep of ten nuns together with their servants (*upasthāyaka*).[7] The word *upasthāyaka* (and Pāli *upaṭṭhāka*), which is quite common in Buddhist literature in the sense of servant or attendant, appears to be rare in inscriptions. In the one other case I can trace, it clearly refers to a nonmonastic, and perhaps royal, role.[8]

The word *pādamūla* or *pādamūlika* is more common in non-Buddhist inscriptional sources, including those of Valabhī.[9] In an extremely interesting, approximately second-century inscribed wooden pillar from central India, we

3. Srinavasan 1976, charter A of Dharasena IV, l. 41: *devakulasya ca khaṇḍasphuṭitaprati*[*saṁ*]*skaraṇa*(*āya*) *sapādamūlaprajīvanāya ca*. In Srinavasan 1976, charter B of Dharasena IV, l. 8, we have *gandhakuṭyāś ca khaṇḍasphuṭitapratisaṁskaraṇāya pādamūlajīvanāya ca*. Bühler 1877: 15, Dhruvasena II, ll. 12–13: *vihāra*[*sya*] *khaṇḍasphuṭitapratisaṁskārāya pādamūlaprajīvanāya*. See also Diskalkar 1925: 36, Dhruvasena II, l. 13, in which the context of the expression *pādamūlaprajīvanāya* is lost. See also Bhandarkar 1872: 45, Dharasena IV. For these Valabhī plates, see also Lévi 1896: 227, 230. The significance of the term *pādamūla* in a very old Prakrit inscription in a Khaṇḍagiri cave (Tatwagumphā cave 2) is not clear; see Prinsep 1837: 1074; Barua 1929: 129; Lüders 1912: §1344.

4. Diskalkar 1925: 27, Śīlāditya I, l. 5: *khaṇḍasphu*[*ṭi*]*taprasaṁskārāya kalpikārapādamūlaprajīvanāya ca*. Noted by Schopen 1994b: 172n59.

5. Diskalkar 1925: 42, Śīlāditya III, l. 24: *vihārapra*[*tibaddhapā*]*damūla*[?]*jīvanāya*, and in another grant of the same king (Diskalkar 1925: 63, l. 53): *etatparibaddhapādamūlaprajīvanāya*. However, I do not know how secure the reconstruction of the first plate is, and the antecedent of the pronoun in the second is, to me, not at all clear. I therefore find it a bit difficult to follow Schmiedchen 1993: 591, who states, without qualification, that here "these servants are additionally paraphrased as *vihārapratibaddha* . . . 'bound to/dependant of [*sic*] the monastery.' "

6. There is considerable controversy over the dates of the Bhauma-Kara kings. Misra 1934 would place this grant around 755, Sircar 1953 would place it around 970, and Ganguly 1975: 199 suggests a date of 980. For references to the discussions, see Mohapatra 1995: 32–34. Mohapatra and, according to him, "most scholars" would now date this grant to 885. Cf. Salomon 1998: 190–191.

7. Misra 1934: 45 (Talcher plate of Śivakaradeva, year 149, I, ll. 27–28). The crucial expressions are *pādamūlasya grāsācchādanaparikalpanārthaṁ* and *daśānāṁ bhikṣuṇīsopasthāyakayuktānāṁ cīvarapiṇḍapātraśayanāsanaglānabhaiśajyārthaṁ*. Plate J, not edited, is said to contain the same text; only the donated land is different.

8. Lüders 1961: §25 (p. 56); Tsukamoto 1996: 642 (Mathurā 12): *abhyaṁt*[*a*]*r*[*o*]*pasthāyaka*. Note also the ninth-century Nālandā copper plates of Devapāladeva, in which we find the expression *svapādapadmopajīvin*, referring to those in the king's service; Majumdar 1926: 20, l. 32 (also Sastri 1942: 98); and Bhattacharyya 1938: 291, l. 15 (also Sastri 1942: 85).

9. For instance, in a grant of Śīlāditya I (Bühler 1880: 239, plate II, l. 4), which is almost the same as charter A of Dharasena IV, quoted above.

find, in a list of official titles and designations the word *pādamūlika*.[10] That it follows *devathayaka* may or may not be relevant to its meaning. In an apparently mid-ninth-century brahmanical grant from the Northwest, we find the word in compound with *bhṛtya*.[11] A brahmanical grant from the Madras region of 1123, confirming an earlier grant of 1087, has a series of expressions very close to what we find in some of the Valabhī Buddhist grants:[12]

> [Such-and-such is given] for the worship of the local god Bhīmeśvara with perfumes, flowers, incense, lamps, oblations, and so on, for the removal of breaks and damage to the old worn-out [parts of the temple], and for fresh plaster work, for the provision of dancing, singing, instrumental music, refreshments, and attendants and retinue [*pādamūlaparivāra*], and in order to feed Brahmins and ascetics.

The word *pādamūla* also occurs in this sense in non-Sanskrit sources, such as a Kannada inscription from 1077 from Mahārāṣṭra.[13]

Two other terms might also be mentioned here, although their significance is far from clear. According to Lüders, *saṁghaprakṛta* designates a layperson employed by the monastic community. He translates the term, which appears twice in the Mathurā inscriptions, both times in the plural, as "commissioners." These individuals made donations to the monastic community.[14] We have no other evidence concerning this status, and it is not entirely clear to me why Lüders has understood the term as he has. Even more problematic is a form read by Fussman in a Kharoṣṭhī reliquary inscription he dated to around the beginning of the common era. Fussman read there the sequence *sagharthaṇieṇa*, which he interpreted as **saṁgha-arthanika*, "designation of a lay servant of the Buddhist monastery," also stating, "[t]he *saṁgharthaṇia*- is he who acts at the request of the community, or according to requests made to the community."[15] But the language of this inscription is highly problematic,

10. Sastri 1925–1926.

11. Kielhorn 1896: ll. 19–20: *khaṇḍasphuṭitasaṁskaraṇāya abhinavakarrmakaraṇāya ca bhṛtyapādamūlabhavaṇāya ca*.

12. Barnett 1913–1914b: 155, ll. 74–75: *tatratya-Bhīmeśvaradevāya gaṁdhapuṣpadhūpadīpanaivedyādyarccanārthaṁ khaṁḍasphuṭitajīrṇṇoddhāranavasudhākarmārthaṁ nṛtyagītavādyabhogapādamūlaparivārārthaṁ vrāhmaṇatapasvibhojanārthaṁ ca*.

13. Barnett 1913–1914a: 283, ll. 244–245: *pādamūlaparigrahakkaṁ*, trans. (290) as "for acceptance by the attendants." The inscription is actually bilingual, but the portion in question is in Kannada.

14. Lüders 1961: 84 (regarding §§47, 65). Fussman 1985: 32 equates the terms *kappiyakāraka*, *saṁghaprakṛta*, and *vaiyyāvṛtyakara* [*sic*], without however providing any evidence for this equivalence. Fussman's discussion of such terms in his 1985 paper deserves reconsideration.

15. Fussman 1985: 30–32.

containing a number of very obscure expressions and miswritings, in light of which the cautious course is perhaps not to see an otherwise unknown technical term here, but to rest content for the moment with the obscurity of the reading, pending further evidence.

In this context, it is important to keep in mind the question whether a conceptual distinction may, in fact, be maintained between "employees," or other workers who are not ordained, including volunteers from among the faithful laity, and the specific roles assigned to monks who are ordained but specialize to some extent in administration or infrastructure. There is no doubt a continuum here, linking those who work in a monastery solely as paid (or unpaid) workers, non-ordained people (such as *upāsakas*) who render assistance, and ordained monks and nuns who carry out various tasks and roles in the administrative hierarchy.[16] With the evidence at hand, it remains difficult to distinguish these thoroughly, and it may be necessary to consider whether such a distinction is even theoretically possible or helpful. This too is a task for the future, one which will require a thorough investigation of the question of servants and service in Indian Buddhist monasticism before it can be adequately addressed.

16. Another element is the status of the *śikṣādattaka*, whose role may be primarily one of (menial) service.

13

Concluding Considerations

We began our investigations by contemplating the question of what it means to be a Buddhist, narrowing that impossibly broad question to what it means to be a Buddhist monk. From there, we noticed the tradition's own distinction between practice (most particularly and paradigmatically, meditation and study) and service. Our investigations have clearly revealed that, despite a significant emphasis, even a pervasive one, on the primacy of meditation and study, there is also substantial evidence in Indian Buddhist literary and other sources of an appreciation of the vital role played by monastic service and administration. Once we recognized the importance placed by certain sources on administration and service, it became our goal to understand as fully as possible what duties and responsibilities were to be undertaken by those assigned specific roles and designated by specific titles. Of particular interest to us at the outset was the title *vaiyāpṛtyakara*, most especially because of the depiction of this monastic administrator in the *Ratnarāśi-sūtra*, a relatively early Mahāyāna scripture which devotes considerable attention to practical concerns of the monastic life. We noticed that while, for the *Ratnarāśi*, the individual designated with the title *vaiyāpṛtyakara* is a monk, equally clearly the same term in the Prātimokṣa rules of the Vinaya literature refers to a nonmonastic assistant, servant, or agent. Further inquiries revealed that this duality seems to be widespread through many genres of Indian Buddhist literature. This conclusion itself is significant. For while our present state of knowledge does

not, to be sure, allow us to be certain of the chronological or geographic origins of most of our materials, their significant heterogeneity with respect to their depictions of the duties and responsibilities connected with this one administrative title, sometimes even diverging within one and the same text, strongly suggests that such multiplicity is not the result of a simple linear, historical evolution, as hypothesized in the case of the *vaiyāpṛtyakara* by Hakamaya, but is rather to be traced more probably to causes such as local differences in terminological usage. This is a hypothesis which, at this time, we remain unable to test. It is, however, circumstantially supported by what we learned from our studies of other conceptually similar vocabulary. For very nearly the same patterns of heterogeneity are to be found in the usages of other terms specifying administrative roles, such as *navakarmika*, *weínà*, *upadhi-vārika*, *vihāra-pāla*, *mómódì*, and so on.

We noted at the outset of our investigation the likelihood, or rather the near certainty, of the existence of localized traditions, the differentiation of which is now probably impossible, due to the nature of our extant sources. In addition, although it is not an altogether unlikely hypothesis that the number and titles of offices increased over time, this does not necessarily imply an actual process of specialization. Especially if we take into consideration the possibility that the awarding of titles was a matter not only of actual responsibility, but also of the well-known bureaucratizing process of rewarding individuals with impressive honorific titles which, nonetheless, do not carry with them any specific (for instance, lexical) meaning, we might well conclude that any hypothesis of increasing specialization over time in the workings of monastic administration is not solidly grounded in a mere proliferation of titles. On the other hand, no matter what one thinks about the process by which the Vinayas took shape through the years, it is also easy to imagine that the number of differentiated tasks and assignments did gradually grow, as new jobs came into being and others were narrowed through specialization (or, alternatively, eliminated). But this may not be the only, or even the predominant, cause of the diversity we have seen. It indeed seems more likely that the more significant cause is to be found in the local origins of much terminology. Original distinctions of local usage may well have been lost through the process of leveling that took place as the literature itself traveled outside the local environment in which it was produced. Just as philologists notice complex contaminations which render it almost impossible to trace back the original sources of the elements which can come together to form texts, so too it may be impossible for us to ever fully sort out the original source elements which contributed to the heterogeneous and diverse structures which our extant literature appears to present to us.

What it *is* possible to detect are generalized patterns. However provisionally, our studies do allow us to sketch from a generalized perspective a good overall, if not specific, picture of the duties and responsibilities of monastic administrators, as such duties are depicted in Indian Buddhist literature. We are able, furthermore, to draw several, suitably provisional, conclusions concerning the status of such administrators. The duties of such offices ranged, evidently, from mundane care of the physical plant of the monastery, comprising basic responsibilities such as seeing after the sweeping of the grounds and the like, through providing for the material well-being of fellow monks, up to the management of corporate funds and the collection and distribution of monies. Sometimes the status of such offices seems to have been quite lofty, while at other times it seems to have been almost, if not precisely, equivalent to that of the defrocked monk in disgrace (*śikṣādattaka*). What is more, our extant sources do not at all allow us to correlate status with title in a one-to-one fashion. Once again, we do not know for certain whether this is due to conflation of originally distinct sources, although this is one likely hypothesis.

One conclusion which does seem to be comparatively sure is that all, or almost all, such offices had the nature of temporary assignments. In some cases, the titles themselves indicate this, at least etymologically, while in others, some usages of the terms suggest it. How candidates for such rotating tasks were selected we do not know, other than the obvious and expected fact that they were, apparently in principle, appointed by formal ecclesiastical act of the monastic community. But here again, there are exceptions, as we saw in a story of a monastic administrator appointed by the monastery's lay owner. The texts in some contexts seem to imply that volunteers were accepted, subject to their fulfillment of certain minimal conditions of character and ability, but no doubt in actual practice there was more to it than this. Further studies may be expected to clarify this process or processes.

Once appointed, what did such administrators or service monks do? It might be useful to establish and maintain a distinction between jobs for the sake of the community at large and jobs which place one in charge of other monks. That is, being responsible for goods may be typologically differentiable from being in charge of people. But this is not to say that such responsibilities did not overlap. In this regard, the fourth chapter of the *Ratnarāśi*, for example, makes it clear that its *vaiyāpṛtyakara* is responsible not only for the well-being of the monks practicing under his protection, but also for at least some of the fiscal administration of the entire community. The formal, legal distinction between the monastic community, on the one hand, and the stūpa, on the other, is also relevant here. The tradition itself acknowledges such a distinction when it talks about property, distinguishing *sāṁghika*, *staupika*, and

paudgalika or community, stūpa, and personal property.[1] On the other hand, in terms of administration, since the universal community—the ideal translocal association of all Buddhist monastics—and the stūpa are ideal constructs and not living entities (as much as they may be considered "living" in some legal senses),[2] it is possible for the actual administration and supervision to be carried out only by actual humans, be they monks or laymen, and not by the inanimate stūpa or the corporate community as an abstract entity. The *vaiyāpṛtyakara*, at least in the tradition of the *Ratnarāśi*, is the agent responsible for looking after the well-being and rights of the three relevant legal entities: the local community, the universal community, and the stūpa. Different sectarian traditions seem to require different relative treatments of the goods belonging to these three. On the basis of Pāli and Chinese Nikāya and Āgama materials, at any rate, it seems that the positions of responsibility for the assignment of lodging, distribution of food, and distribution of robes are the most essential and central—which is to say, paradigmatic—posts in the monastic administration, and specific responsibility for people as opposed to things is not a prominent feature of these accounts. It is possible that this may imply a certain stage of development and organization of the monastic community, but it would require a careful and thorough examination of all available Vinaya materials before any generalizations might be offered in this respect. In addition, although these and other various specific duties are the province of a multitude of named administrators in a number of textual traditions, we find, for instance, that in the *Ratnarāśi*, many of these responsibilities seem to be subsumed under one heading, that of *vaiyāpṛtyakara*, a fact which serves again to reinforce the impression we noted above of the heterogeneity of the tradition with respect to such attributions.

In our initial survey of the tension between service and practice, we noticed examples of the advocacy of both opposite extremes in different Mahāyāna scriptures. And indeed, although the majority of materials to which we appealed came from the Vinaya literature, we were not able to detect any significant ideological differences between the generalized standpoint of this literature and that of our Mahāyāna sources. In other words, contrary to what the statements found in some Mahāyāna scriptures might suggest, the more radical disapprovals of monastic service and the failure to acknowledge its importance cannot be attributed to the Mahāyāna as a whole, as is amply and

1. Even in Mahāyāna sūtra literature this is evident as it is, of course, in the Vinayas. The *Rāṣṭrapālaparipṛcchā*, for example, explicitly criticizes the confusion of these three types of property (Finot 1901: 29.8): *staupika saṁghikaṁ hy api ca vittaṁ paudgalikaṁ ca tac ca samam eṣām.*

2. See Schopen 1990/1997.

elegantly illustrated by the depiction of the administrative monk in the *Ratnarāśi-sūtra*. To be sure, some Mahāyāna sources do seem to present the relative valuations of meditative practice and administrative service in a dichotomous and oppositional light. Whether this was intended to be taken literally, or should rather be understood, for instance, as an example of the type of radical discourse we sometimes encounter in texts like the *Perfection of Wisdom* scriptures is not, at this point, clear. Perhaps, once more, further comprehensive studies of the texts in which such passages are found will help to clarify this question.

There is no single answer to the question of what it means to be a Buddhist, nor even one single answer to the question of what it means to be a Buddhist monk. One may, certainly, be a meditator and seek to fathom the truths of the Buddhist teachings through introspection. Or one may be a scholar, mastering the accumulated learning of earlier generations of thinkers, and even surpassing it. And no doubt, although less formally recognized, if explicitly acknowledged at all, many monks aspire to nothing very particular, but end up within the community for reasons they cannot very well explain, or even that have nothing to do with their own volition (such as child oblation, an interesting topic yet to be explored in the context of Indian Buddhism). But the results of our present study also compel us to acknowledge the important place of service within the monastic bureaucracy, and the vital and apparently often emically well-appreciated contribution of monks who chose administrative duties, or had them thrust upon them. What we have learned of the structure of these administrative duties also suggests that even those who made such contributions likely did not do so to the exclusion of other pursuits—administration was not their vocation. We do not yet know if it would be a parallel helpful to understanding this status to think of the professor who accepts the role of departmental chair for several years or who serves on one or more committees, or whether rather we should imagine a cooperative store to which members donate several days of service each month, their duties corresponding to their abilities, or whether we should turn to yet another model altogether.

The questions remaining are legion, and indeed they far outnumber those we have been able to answer. Nevertheless, we have managed to lay some groundwork for an appreciation of the vital role played by monastic administrators in Indian Buddhism, introduced the most pertinent available sources, and tried to delimit the ranges of responsibilities which structure the ideal images of monastic administration and service in textual sources. As Indian Buddhist literature, particularly the vast commentary literature on the Vinaya texts preserved primarily in Tibetan translation, is further studied, it will

certainly be possible to further nuance, correct, or even refute some of the ideas set forth in this volume. It likewise remains a task for the future to confront the materials we have gathered together with what can be learned of the Buddhist monastic systems of administration in medieval Sri Lanka and in China and Tibet. If and how researches in these areas are able to shed light on their Indic backgrounds remains to be determined. But given what we have learned so far from the Indian literature, one thing that seems likely is that it will be less difficult than it previously was to recognize in Sri Lankan, Tibetan, and Chinese sources innovations introduced outside the Indian cultural sphere. As a result, studies of Indian Buddhist monastic administration will be enriched by future studies of monastic administration elsewhere in Asia, as I hope and trust they will enrich such studies in return.

Supplementary Note

On the *Aupadhika-puṇyakriyāvastu* and *Dhruvabhikṣā*

In several points in our discussions, an issue has arisen with regard to what are known as the seven *aupadhika-puṇyakriyāvastu*. Regarding this category, as is not unusual, Xuanzang's translation of the *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya* gives a list expanded somewhat over that in the extant Sanskrit text:[1] 如七有依福業事中先說應施客、行、病、侍、園林、常食、及寒風熱、隨時衣藥 (Taishō text: 食等). According to this list, the seven material offerings to create merit are to give to a (1) guest, (2) traveler, (3) sick person, or (4) nurse; to give (5) a grove, (6) a constant source of food, and (7) clothing and medication (variant: food, etc.) according to the time, when it is (particularly) cold, windy, or hot. Although the Sanskrit text of the *Bhāṣya* does not contain this discussion in extenso,[2] it appears to be based on the *Mahācunda-sūtra* in the *Madhyamāgama*. A Sanskrit version of this sūtra is quoted in Yaśomitra's *Abhidharmakośavyākhyā*, which allows us to see the technical terms in question:[3]

> iha canda śrāddhaḥ kulaputro vā kuladuhitā vā (1) cāturdiśāya bhikṣusaṁghāyārāmaṁ pratipādayati | idaṁ cunda prathamam aupadhikaṁ puṇyakriyāvastu mahāphalaṁ yāvan mahāvaistārikaṁ | yena samanvāgatasya

1. *ad* iv.117, T. 1558 (XXIX) 96b16–18 (*juan* 18).
2. Pradhan 1975: 270.
3. Wogihara 1936b: 353.20–29.

kulaputrasya vā vistareṇa yāvad upajāyata evan puṇyaṁ | punar aparaṁ cunda śrāddhaḥ kulaputro vā kuladuhitā vā (2) tasminn evārāme vihāraṁ pratiṣṭhāpayati . . . (3) tasminn evārāme vihāre śayanāsanaṁ prayacchati | tadyathā mañcaṁ pīṭhaṁ bṛṣīṁ koccavaṁ bimbopadhānaṁ caturaśrakaṁ dadāti . . . (4) tasminn eva vihāre dhruvabhikṣāṁ prajñāpayaty anukūlayajñām . . . (5) āgantukāya gamikāya vā dānaṁ dadāti . . . (6) glānāya glānopasthāyakāya vā dānaṁ dadāti . . . (7) yās tā bhavanti śītalikā vā vaddalikā vā vātalikā vā varṣalikā vā tadrūpāsu śītalikāsu yāvad varṣalikāsu bhaktāni vā tarpaṇāni vā yavāgūpānāni vā tāni saṁghāyābhinirhṛtyānuprayaccati | idam ārya asmākam anārdragātrāḥ anabhivṛṣṭacīvarāḥ paribhujya sukhaṁ sparśaṁ viharantu.

Of these seven items, it is the fourth in the Sanskrit list (sixth in Xuanzang's Chinese) which is of particular interest to us, given the appearance of the Tibetan *'tsho ba nar ma* in several stories translated from the *Karmaśataka* story collection.[4] I believe it can be established beyond doubt that this *'tsho ba nar ma* renders *dhruvabhikṣā,* and that the meaning is as I gave it, namely, the provision of permanent alms, or a constant provision of a source of food (for the monks). There are a number of sources available which justify this identification. In the first place, the Tibetan translation of Yaśomitra's *Abhidharmakośavyākhyā* itself may be cited. The full sentence in question reads in Sanskrit:[5]

punar aparaṁ cunda śrāddhaḥ kulaputro kuladuhitā vā tasminn eva vihāre *dhruvabhikṣāṁ* prajñāpayaty anukūlayajñām | idaṁ cunda caturtham aupadhikaṁ puṇyakriyāvastu mahāphalaṁ pūrvavat |

To this, corresponds the following Tibetan translation:[6]

skul byed gzhan yang dad pa'i rigs kyi bu'am rigs kyi bu mo gtsugs lag khang de nyid du mchod sbyin rjes su mthun pa'i *'tsho ba nar mar* 'bul bar byed de | skul byed 'di ni rdzas las byung ba'i bsod nams bya ba'i dngos po 'bras bu che ba bzhi pa yin no zhes bya ba snga ma bzhin no ||

The same may be found in the Chinese translation of the *Mahācunda-sūtra,* which speaks of "constant giving to the community of morning gruel

4. My thanks are due to Achim Bayer for his valuable hints about this word.
5. Wogihara 1936b: 353.18–19, *ad Abhidharmakośa* IV.4.
6. D 4092, *mngon pa, ngu* 9a1–2.

and the mid-day meal,"[7] and in the quotation of this sūtra as translated into Tibetan in Śamathadeva's *Abhidharmakoṣaṭīkopāyikā*:[8]

> skul byed gzhan yang dad pa'i rigs kyi bu'am rigs kyi bu mo gnas de nyid du rjes su mthun pa'i *'tsho ba nar ma* 'bul bar byed pa 'di ni skul byed rdzas las byung ba'i bsod nams bya ba'i dngos po bzhi pa ste | 'bras bu che ba zhes bya ba nas snga ma bzhin du bsod nams nye bar skye ba zhes bya ba'i bar du'o ||

Now, it is interesting that there is a section in the *Varṣāvastu* of the Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya which discusses the occasions on which a monk may leave the isolation of the rain retreat, enumerating the obligations owed to a layperson.[9] The Sanskrit text appears to list twelve types of circumstances, some of which bear some yet unclear relation to the list of the seven *aupadhikapuṇyakriyāvastu*. In particular, the second item in the *Varṣāvastu* refers to the construction of a monastery, the third to its provision with bedding and seats, and the fourth to the provision of a constant supply of food, or permanent alms. The Sanskrit text reads as follows:[10]

> aparam apy upāsakasya karaṇīyaṁ yathāpi tad upāsakaḥ tasmiṁn eva vihāre *dhruvabhikṣāṁ* prajñapayitukāmo bhavaty anukūlayaṁjñāṁ <|> tena tatra prabhūto vastralā**bha**ḥ āmiṣalā**bha**ś ca samupānīto bhavati sa bhikṣūṇāṁ dūtam anupreṣayaṁty āgaṁchaṁtv āryaḥ paribhokṣyaṁte gantavyaṁ bhikṣuṇā saptāham adhiṣṭhāya upāsakasya karaṇīyena idam upāsakasya karaṇīyaṁ

> There is a further obligation for a lay brother. Suppose that a lay brother desires to designate a permanent alms-giving in that same vihāra [which he built and endowed], an appropriate offering. He gathers an abundance of cloth possessions and food possessions there.[11] He sends a messenger to the monks. [The messenger says:] "Come, the Noble Ones will enjoy this!" A monk, having been authorized for a period of seven days, must go on account of an obligation for a lay brother. This is an obligation for a lay brother.

7. T. 26 (2.7) (I) 428a12–13 (*juan* 2): 復次周那、有信族姓男族姓女。於房舍中常施於衆朝粥中食.

8. P 5595, *mngon pa*, *tu* 229b6–7.

9. See Schopen 1992b, in which this material is treated.

10. Dutt 1939–1959: iii.4.139.2–7, facsimile 76b1–2 (735).

11. Schopen 1992b: 77 follows the printed text, which reads *vastulābha āmiṣalābha*, and translates "material things and worldly things." However, Tibetan *gos kyi rnyed pa dang zas kyi rnyed pa* and the orthographic similarity between *tu* and *tra* in the Gilgit script make the reading almost sure.

Unfortunately, the corresponding Tibetan translation appears to omit *dhruvabhikṣā*, although it clearly renders *anukūla-yajñā* with *mthun pa'i mchod sbyin*.[12] After the description of obligations owed to a layperson, however, the text offers an abbreviated repetition, with the difference that the potential donor is instead a monk. The relevant Sanskrit text has:[13]

> aparam api bhikṣor karaṇīyaṁ yathāpi tad bhikṣu asminn evārāme vihāraṁ śayanāsanaṁ *dhruvabhikṣāṁ* tathāgatasya śārīraṁ stūpam alam ekaṁ yaṣṭyāropaṇaṁ dhvajāropaṇaṁ sūtranikāyānām anyatamānyatamaṁ sūtranikāyaṁ kaukṛtyaṁ pāpakaṁ dṛ**ṣṭi**gatam utpannaṁ bhavati sa bhikṣūṇāṁ dūtam anupreṣayati āgacchaṁtv āyuṣmaṁtaḥ utpannaṁ pāpakaṁ dṛṣṭigataṁ pratinisṛjāpayiṣyanti gantavyaṁ bhikuṇā saptāhamadhiṣṭhāya bhikṣoḥ karaṇīyena idaṁ bhikṣoḥ karaṇīyaṁ pūrvavat sarvaṁ vistareṇa vā**cya**ṁ ||

Here, both the Tibetan and Chinese translations are clear in their understanding of *dhruvabhikṣā*, rendering *'tsho ba brtan po* and *chángqíng gòngyǎng* 常請供養, respectively.[14]

12. D 1, *'dul ba, ka* 242a5–7; S 1, *'dul ba, ka* 246a2–4:

gzhan yang dge bsnyen gyi bya ba 'di lta ste | dge bsnyen gyis gtsug lag khang de nyid du mthun pa'i mchod sbyin brtan po bca' bar 'dod nas | des der gos kyi rnyed pa dang zas kyi rnyed pa mang du sta gon byas te | des dge slong rnams la pho nya btang nas | 'phags pa dag longs spyod pa dag dbul gyis tshur sbyon cig ces spring na | zhag bdun byin gyis brlabs la[a] dge bsnyen gyi bya ba'i phyir dge slong 'gro bar bya ste | 'di ni dge bsnyen gyi bya ba yin no ||

a) S + |

The Chinese translation of this section appears to be differently organized than the Sanskrit and Tibetan texts. Although I still have some doubt, apparently corresponding is T. 1445 (XXIII) 1042c15–18: 若鄔波索迦、欲與苾芻臥具等物、并種種衣食、喚苾芻曰。唯願聖衆哀受我施衣食。佛言。苾芻應守持七日法出界外。是名鄔波索迦緣。

13. *Varṣāvastu* of the Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya. Dutt 1939–1959: iii.4.141.6–13, facsimile 77a3–5 (736).

14. D 1, *'dul ba, ka* 243a7–b3; S 1, *'dul ba, ka* 347b4–348a2:

gzhan yang dge slong gi bya ba 'di lta ste | dge slong gis kun dga' ra ba de nyid du gtsug lag khang dang | gnas mal dang | 'tsho ba brtan po dang | de bzhin gshegs pa'i sku gdung gi mchod rten[a] la dri sna tshogs kyis byug pa dang | tsan dan gyis byug pa dang | srog shing gzugs pa dang | rgyal mtshan gzugs pa dang | mdo sde'i ris bzhi las mdo sde'i ris gang yang rung ba dang | 'gyod pa dang | sdig pa'i lta bar song ba skyes nas[b] des dge slong rnams la pho nya btang ste | tshe dang ldan pa dag sdig pa'i lta bar song ba skyes pa so sor bsal gyis tshur sbyon cig ces spring na | zhag bdun byin gyis brlabs la[b] dge slong gi bya ba'i phyir dge slong 'gro bar bya ste | 'di ni dge slong gi bya ba yin te | thams cad gong ma bzhin du rgyas par brjod par bya'o ||

a) S + dang | de   b) S + |

T. 1445 (XXIII) 1043a23–27:
又苾芻緣。施諸苾芻園已。復更施臥具。并與常請供養。或爲設利羅造塔。或復塗檀及欝金等諸香。或安相輪。及幢幡蓋等。并設供養四部衆等。書寫經等。如上諸緣來請。苾芻應受七日法去。是名苾芻緣.

A correspondent to the term *dhruvabhikṣā* also appears in Pāli. In the Pāli Vinaya, the monk Sudhamma is described as *dhuva-bhattika*.[15] Translators have disagreed about the interpretations of this word. Rhys Davids and Oldenberg rendered, "[T]he venerable Sudhamma was residing at Ma*kkh*ikâsa*nd*a in dependence upon *K*itta the householder, superintending the new buildings he erected, and being constantly supplied by him with food."[16] This is very reasonable. Yet Horner disagreed, offering, "[T]he venerable Sudhamma was a resident in the householder Citta's Macchikāsaṇḍa, an overseer of new buildings, a constant adviser."[17] In a note, she explains, "*dhuvabhattika* usually means a 'regular or constant diner.' But *bhattika* is given this other meaning at [*Therīgāthā-aṭṭhakathā*] 267 (cf. *PED* [Rhys Davids and Stede 1921-1925]), and seems justified above."[18] Indeed, the *Therīgāthā* comentary *ad Therīgāthā* 413 has *bhattikatan ti kata-sāmi-bhattikaṁ*, which Pruitt rendered, "Who had shown [him] devotion means: acting like my husband's servant."[19] But this may not be relevant: is it not (*dhuva-bhatti*)-*ka*, rather than *dhuva-bhattika*? When we look at the two occurrences of the term *dhuvabhatta* in the Pāli Vinaya, it indeed clearly means "one who constantly supplied food to the community."[20] And when we compare the perhaps related compound *dhurabhatta* in the *Visuddhimagga*, we see that it too clearly refers to food.[21] Moreover, we may compare also Pāli *dhuva-yāgu*, a constant supply of gruel, something which is offered by a donor.[22]

15. Oldenberg 1879–1883: ii.15.29–31 (I.18.1).

16. Rhys Davids and Oldenberg 1881–1885: II.359.

17. Horner 1938–1966: v.22.

18. Horner 1938–1966: v.22n4.

19. Pruitt 1998: 337.

20. Oldenberg 1879–1883: i.25.37, i.243.24–25; the latter reads: *ahaṁ buddhapamukhassa bhikkhusaṁghassa dhuvabhattena*.

21. Warren and Kosambi 1950: II.27.

22. Oldenberg 1879–1883: 292.12 (VIII.15.7), 293.18 (VIII.15.10).

Textual Materials

1. *Ākāśagarbha-sūtra*, cited in the *Śikṣāsamuccaya*. Cambridge manuscript Add. 1478 (below MS): 38a1–3; Bendall 1897–1902: 64.10–12:

> dhyāyī bhikṣuḥ sukṣetraṁ | nādhyayanā**vai**yāpṛtyāśritā nādhyayanābhiyuktāḥ || samādhidhāraṇīkṣāntibhūmiṣu bhājanībhūtā dakṣiṇīyāḥ pātrabhūtāḥ | ālokakarā lokasya mārgopadeśakāḥ | karmakṣetrakleśakṣetrāt satvān uttārayanti | nirvvāṇagamane ca mā**rge** pratiṣṭhāpayanti |

D 3940, *dbu ma, khi* 41b7–42a2; P 5336, *dbu ma, ki* 51a1–3:

> dge slong bsam gtan pa ni zhing dam pa yin gyi | klog pa dang zhal ta byed pa la gnas pa dang klog pa la brtson pa ni ting nge 'dzin dang gzungs dang bzod pa'i sa rnams kyi snod du gyur pa 'am shin tu sbyin gnas su gyur pa'am[1] | snod du gyur ba dang | 'jig rten la snang bar byed pa'am[2] nye bar ston par byed pa'am las kyi zhing dang nyon mongs pa'i zhing las sems can rnams sgrol ba dang mya ngan las 'das par 'gro ba'i lam la 'jog pa ma yin pa'i phyir te |
>
> 1) Pram *for* pa'am 2) P+ |
>
> This translation appears to be defective in the clause *klog pa dang zhal ta byed pa la gnas pa dang klog pa la brtson pa ni*, from which, at the very least, some negation has dropped.

Chinese of *Śikṣāsamuccaya* at T. 1636 (XXXII) 88b12–15 (*juan* 5).

The Tibetan version of the sūtra itself is found at D 260, *mdo sde, za* 278a3–4; S 120, *mdo sde, pha* 22a5–7:

> dge slong bsam gtan pa ni zhing dam pa yin kyi[1] | kha ton pa dang zhal ta la gnas pa ni ma yin pa'i phyir te | dge slong bsam gtan pa dag ni ting nge 'dzin dang | gzungs dang | bzod pa dang |[2] sa dag la snod du gyur pa | sbyin gnas dam pa |[3] snod dam par gyur pa | 'jig rten gyi snang bar byed pa | lam ston par byed pa | las kyi zhing dang nyon mongs pa'i zhing las sems can rnams sgrol bar byed pa | mya ngan las 'das bar 'gro ba'i lam la gshog par byed pa'o ||
>
> 1) S gyi 2) S ø | 3) D ø |

There are several Chinese translations of the sūtra: T. 405 (XIII) 654a7–10; T. 406 (XIII) 660b19–21; T. 408 (XIII) 674a28–b4 (*juan xia*); in T. 407 (XIII) 666b: no equivalent.

2. *Adhyāśayasaṁcodana-sūtra*. S 11.25, *dkon brtsegs, ca* 269a5–270a5; P 760 (25), *dkon brtsegs, zi* 149a8–150a4; D 69, *dkon brtsegs, ca* 150a1–b3:

> byams pa gzhan yang khyod mos par bya'o|| khyod kyis khong du chud par bya'o || byang chub sems dpa' gang dag la sbyor ba med cing bsam gtan med la spong ba med cing 'don pa med pa dang | mang du thos pa yongs su tshol ba med pa de dag ni de bzhin gshegs pa'i bstan pa la rab tu byung ba ma yin no || byams pa de bzhin gshegs pa'i bstan pa ni bsam gtan dang spong bas phye ba dang | ye shes kyis 'dus byas pa dang | ye shes kyis mnyam par gzhag pa dang | brtson pas phye ba yin gyi | khyim pa'i las dang zhal ta byed pas phye ba ni ma yin te | 'di ltar zhal ta byed pa'i las de ni mi rigs pa la sbyor ba rnams dang | 'du byed la mngon par dga' ba rnams dang | 'jig rten pa'i bya bas sbags pa ste | byang chub sems dpas de la 'dod pa bskyed par mi bya'o || byams pa gal te byang chub sems dpa' zhal ta byed pa la brtson pas rin po che sna bdun gyi mchod rten dag gis stong gsum gyi stong chen po'i 'jig rten gyi khams 'di bkang na des ni nga mnyes par byas pa ma yin | ri mor byas pa ma yin | bkur bstir byas pa ma yin gyi | byams pa gal te byang chub sems dpa' tha na pha rol tu phyin pa dang ldan pa'i tshig bzhi pa'i tshigs su bcad pa gcig tsam 'dzin tam | 'chang ngam | klog gam | kun chub par byed dam | 'chad na des ni nga la bkur stir byas | bla mar byas | ri mor byas | mchod par byas par 'gyur ro || de ci'i phyir zhe na | byams pa de bzhin gshegs pa rnams kyi byang chub ni mang du thos pa las byung ba yin gyi | dngos po yongs su 'dzin pa las byung ba ni ma yin pa'i phyir ro || byams pa

gal te byang chub sems dpa' zhal ta byed pa la brtson pas byang chub sems dpa' lung nod pa dang | kha ton byed pa la brtson pa zhal ta byed pa'i sbag pas sbags par byed pa na | bsod nams 'dod pa des ni bsod nams ma yin pa'i phung po chen po skyed par 'gyur te | las kyi sgrib pa yang yongs su 'dzin par 'gyur ro || de ci'i phyir zhe na | bsod nams bya ba'i gzhi gsum po gang yin pa de dag thams cad ni shes rab las byung ba'i phyir ro || byams pa de lta bas na byang chub sems dpa' zhal ta byed pa la brtson pas byang chub sems dpa' lung nod pa dang | kha ton byed pa la brtson pa'i bar chad mi bya'o || 'dzam bu'i gling 'di zhal ta byed pas yongs su gang bar gyur pa'i zhal ta byed pa de dag thams cad kyis ni byang chub sems dpa' lung nod pa dang | kha ton byed pa la brtson pa gcig la rim gro dang bsnyen bkur bya'o || byang chub sems dpa' lung nod pa dang | kha ton byed pa la brtson pa 'dzam bu'i gling gang ba snyed kyis ni byang chub sems dpa' nang du yang dag 'jog la brtson pa gcig la rim gro dang bsnyen bkur bya'o ||

The Peking text here is remarkably bad; leaf 149 is a supplement, which was extremely sloppily executed. There is no point in recording its variants. Variants between Derge and sTog are entirely trivial.

Chinese translations of the sūtra at T. 310 (25) (XI) 527a28–b22 (*juan* 92); T. 327 (XII) 50c27–51a21 (*juan xia*).
Śikṣāsamuccaya MS 59b1–5; Bendall 1897–1902: 113.19–114.9:

api tv ārocayāmi te maitreya prativedayāmi te | na te bo(dhi)satvās tathāgataśāsane pravrajitā yeṣān nāsti yogo nāsti dhyānaṁ **nā**sti prahāṇaṁ nāsty adhyayanaṁ nāsti bāhuśrutyaparyeṣṭiḥ | api tu maitreya dhyānaprahāṇaprabhāvitaṁ tathāgataśāsanaṁ jñānasaṁskr̥taṁ jñānasamāhitaṁ abhiyogapra(bh)āvitaṁ | na gr̥hikarmāntavaiyāpr̥tyaprabhāvitaṁ | ayuktayogānām e**ta**t karma saṁsārābhiratānāṁ yad uta vaiyāpr̥tyaṁ laukikakr̥tyapaligodhaḥ | na tatra bodhisatvena spr̥hotpādayitavyā | sacen maitreya vaiyāpr̥tyābhirato bodhisatvaḥ saptaratnamayai stūpair imaṁ trisāhasramahā**sā**hasraṁ lokadhātuṁ pūrayet\ | nāhaṁ tenārādhito bhaveyaṁ na mānito nāpi satkr̥taḥ | pe | tatra jambūdvīpaḥ pūritaḥ syād vaiyāpr̥tyakarair bodhisatvaiḥ sarvais tair ekasyoddeśasvādhyāyābhiyuktasya bo**dhi**satvasyopasthānaparicaryā karaṇīyā | jambūdvīpapramāṇaiś coddeśasvādhyāyābhiyuktair bodhisatvair ekasya pratisaṁlayanābhiyuktasya bodhisatvasyopastānaparicaryā[1] kartavyā |

1) Read °sthā°

D 3940, *dbu ma, khi* 65b7–66a5; P 5336, *dbu ma, ki* 77a8–b7:

byams pa khyod la bstan to ||[1] khyod kyis[2] khong du chud par bya'o || gang dag la brtson pa med pa dang | bsam gtan med pa dang | spong ba med pa dang | kha ton bya ba dang mang du thos pa yongs su tshol ba med pa'i byang chub sems dpa' de dag ni de bzhin gshegs pa'i bstan pa la rab tu byung ba ma yin no || byams pa de bzhin gshegs pa'i bstan pa ni bsam gtan dang spong bas rab tu phye ba | ye shes kyis 'dus byas pa ye shes kyis mnyam par gzhag[3] pa | mngon par brtson bas rab tu phye ba yin gyi khyim pa'i las kyi mtha' dang zhal ta byed pas rab tu phye ba ni ma yin no || mi rigs pa la brtson pa dang 'khor ba la mngon bar dga' ba rnams kyi las ni 'di yin te | 'di ltar zhal ta byed pa dang 'jig rten pa'i bya bas gzings pa ste | de la byang chub sems dpa' rnams kyis 'dod pa bskyed par mi bya'o || byams pa zhal ta byed pa la brtson pa'i byang chub sems dpa' gal te rin po che sna bdun gyi mchod rten rnams kyis stong gsum gyi stong chen po'i 'jig rten gyi khams 'di bkang yang des nga mnyes par byas par mi 'gyur rim gro byas par mi 'gyur bsti stang[4] byas par mi 'gyur ro || de bzhin du sbyar ro || de la zhal ta byed pa'i byang chub sems dpa' 'dzam bu'i gling yongs su gang ba de dag gis | lung 'bogs pa dang kha ton la brtson pa'i byang chub sems dpa' gcig la rim gro dang bsnyen bkur bya'o || lung dbog[5] pa dang kha ton la brtson pa'i byang chub sems dpa' 'dzam bu'i gling gi tshad rnyed[6] kyis | nang du yang dag 'jog la mngon bar brtson pa'i byang chub sems dpa' gcig[7] la rim gro dang bkur sti bya'o ||

1) P mos par bya'o *for* la bstan to || 2) P kyi 3) P bzhag 4) P stangs 5) P 'bog 6) P snyed 7) P cig

Chinese *Śikṣāsamuccaya* at T. 1636 (XXXII) 97a25–b7 (*juan* 7).

3. *Bodhisattvabhūmi*. Wogihara 1936a: 16.1–10; Dutt 1978: 10.23–29:

na cainam utkṛṣṭatarebhyaḥ śraddhācchandasamādānavīryopāya guṇebhyo vicchandya[1] nihīnatarakeṣu[2] śraddhācchandasamādāna-vīryopāyaguṇeṣu samādāpayati | tadyathā mahāyānād vicchandya[1] śrāvakayāne vā pratyekabuddhayāne vā bhāvanāmayād vicchandya[1] cintāmaye cintāmayād vicchandya[1] śrutamaye śrutamayād vicchandya[1] vaiyāpṛtyakarmaṇi śīlamayād vicchandya[1] dānamaye | ity evaṁbhāgīyebhya utkṛṣṭatarakebhyo[3] guṇebhyo na vicchandya[1] evaṁbhāgīyeṣu nihīnatarakeṣu[2] guṇeṣu samādāpayati | iyaṁ caturthī mitrasaṁpat |

1) Dutt: vicchandayitvā 2) Dutt: °tareṣu 3) Dutt: °tarebhyo

D 4037, *sems tsam, wi* 9ab1–5:

> de dad pa dang | ’dun pa dang | yang dag par blang ba dang | brtson ’grus dang | thabs kyi yon tan ches kyad par du ’phags pa dag las ’dun pa bzlog la | dad pa dang | ’dun pa dang | yang dag par blang ba dang | brtson ’grus dang | thabs kyi yon tan ches dman ba dag la ’jug par mi byed de | ’di lta ste | theg pa chen po las ’dun pa bzlog la | nyan thos kyi theg pa’am | rang sangs rgyas kyi theg pa la ’jug par mi byed pa dang | bsgoms pa las byung ba las ’dun pa bzlog la | bsams pa las byung ba la ’jug pa’am | bsams pa las byung ba las ’dun pa bzlog la | thos pa las byung ba la ’jug pa’am | thos pa las byung ba las ’dun pa bzlog la | zhal ta byed pa la ’jug par mi byed pa dang | tshul khrims las byung ba las ’dun pa bzlogs la | sbyin pa las byung ba la ’jug pa’am | de ltar ’di ste bu dang mthun pa’i yon tan ches khyad par du ’phags pa dag las ’dun pa bzlog la | ’di lta bu dang mthun pa’i yon tan ches dman pa dag ’dzin du ’jug par mi byed pa ’di ni bshes gnyen phun sum tshogs pa bzhi ba’o ||

Chinese T. 1579 (XXX) 481b19–26 (*juan* 35).

4. *Abhisamācārika* of the Mahāsāṁghika Vinaya. Biku Igihō Kenkyūkai 1998: 83.6–12 (cf. Jinananda 1969: 65.3–9):

> bhagavān āha | tena hi evaṁ sarvvehi śeyyāsane pratipadyitavyaṁ | kin ti dāni evaṁ hi sarvvehi śeyyāsane pratipadyitavyaṁ | ete dāni vihārakā bhavanti oddriṇṇakā paluggakā acaukṣā apratisaṁskr̥takā tato raṇaraṇāye gaṇḍiṁ āhaṇiya sarvvasaṁghena sannipatitavyaṁ | atha dāni kaścid āha | ahan dharmmakathiko ahaṁ vinayadharo aham āraṇyako piṇḍacāriko pāṁsukuliko ya ete droṇī śramaṇakā te pratisaṁskariṣyantīti | te vināyātikramam āsādayanti |

Perhaps *odriṇṇakā* is to be connected with Sanskrit *ava√dr̥̄* (ppp. *avadīrṇa*—or *ud℘dr̥̄* > *uddīrṇa*). For *paluggakā*, compare Pāli *palugga* =BHS *pralugna* (broken up); *acaukṣā* is to be connected with Sanskrit *caukṣa* (and Richard Salomon points to Gāndhārī *ayokṣa*). The word *raṇaraṇāye* is an onomatopoeia. The exact relation of this passage to T. 1425 (XXII) 504a9ff. (*juan* 34) is not entirely clear. (This passage is more carefully discussed by Seishi Karashima in his forthcoming study of the text.)

5. *Sāgaramatiparipr̥cchā*, cited in the *Śikṣāsamuccaya*. MS 30a3–b1; Bendall 1897–1902: 50.10–51.3:

punar aparaṁ bhagavan bodhisatvaḥ kalyāṇamitrapratirūpakāṇi pāpamitrāṇi sevate bhajate paryupāste | ye hy enaṁ saṁgrahavastubhyo vicchandya puṇyasambhārāt saddha**rma**parigrahād vicchandya pravivekye niyojayanti | alpārthāyālpakr̥tyatāyāṁ niyojayanti | śrāvaka pratyekabuddhapratisaṁyuktāś cāsmai kathā abhīkṣṇaṁ deśayanti ||

yasmiṁś ca samaye bodhisatvo **vi**vekavāsena mahāyāne ’bhyudgacchet tasmin samaye taṁ bodhisatvaṁ vaiyāpr̥tyapaligodhe niyojayanti vaiyāpr̥tyaṁ bodhisatvenāvaśyaṁ karaṇīyaṁ\ || yasmiṁś ca samaye bodhisatvo vai**yā**pr̥tye saṁniyojayitavyas tasmin samaye viveke niyojayanti | evañ cainam vadanti ārabdhavīryasya bodhisatvasya bodhir na kusīdasya | sacet tvam aṣṭābhir navabhir vvā kalpair anuttarāṁ sa**mya**ksambodhin nābhisaṁbhotsyase | na bhūyaḥ śakyasy anuttarāṁ samyaksaṁbodhim abhisamboddhum\ | tatra bhagavan bodhisatvo ’tyārabdhena vīryeṇa sthānaṁ khalu punar etad vidyate yan nirvāṇa(ph)alaṁ [b1] **prā**pnuyād ayam bhagavan bodhisatvasya kalyāṇamitrapratirūpakeṇa daśamo mārāṅkuśaḥ |

D 3940, *dbu ma, khi* 33b1–6; P 5336, *dbu ma, ki* 40b7–41a7:

bcom ldan ’das gzhan yang byang chub sems dpa’ dge ba’i bshes gnyen ltar bcos pa’i sdig pa’i grogs po gang dag de la[1] bsdu ba’i[2] dngos po rnams las ’dun pa bzlog pa dang | sems can yongs su smin par bgyid pa las ’dun pa bzlog pa dang | dam pa’i chos yongs su bzung ba las ’dun pa bzlog pa dang | bsod nams kyi tshogs las ’dun pa bzlog pa dang | rab tu dben pa la sbyor ba dang | don chung zhing bgyid pa nyung ba la sbyor ba dang | nyan thos dang rang sangs rgyas dang ldan pa’i bka’ mchid de la rgyun du[3] mang du ston pa dang | theg pa chen po dang ldan pa’i bka’ mchid de la mi ston pa dag la bsnyen cing ba sten te | bsnyen bkur bgyid pa dang | gang gi tshe byang chub sems dpa’ dben par gnas pas theg pa chen po las ldang ba’i tshe |[4] byang chub sems dpa’ gdon mi za bar zhal ta byed par bya’o zhes byang chub sems dpa’ zhal ta bgyid pa’i dri ma la sbyor ba dang | gang gi tshe byang chub sems dpa’ zhal ta bgyid pa’i dri ma la sbyor ba de’i tshe dben pa la sbyor zhing de la ’di skad du byang chub ni byang chub sems dpa’ brtson ’grus brtsams pa yin gyi[5] le lo can ni ma yin no || gal te khyod bskal pa brgyad dam bcus bla na med pa yang dag par rdzogs pa’i byang chub mngon par rdzogs par sangs ma rgyas na phyis khyod bla na med pa yang dag par rdzogs pa’i byang chub mngon par rdzogs par ’tshang rgya bar[6] mi nus so zhes mchi la | bcom ldan ’das de la byang chub sems dpa’ gang sgyid lug nas ’bras bu thob par bgyid pa’i gnas mchis nas[7] |

bcom ldan 'das 'di ni byang chub sems dpa'i dge ba'i bshes gnyen ltar bcos pa'i bdud kyi lcags kyu ste bcu pa'o ||

1) P ø 2) P pa'i 3) P tu 4) P ø 5) D byi 6) P sangs rgyas par *for* 'tshang rgya bar 7) P na

Chinese *Śikṣāsamuccaya* T. 1636 (XXXII) 85a20–29 (*juan* 4).

There are some problems with the passage, and the Tibetan text appears to diverge significantly from the Sanskrit at points, but the relevant portion seems clear.

S 134, *mdo sde, ba* 146b3–147b5; D 152, *mdo sde, pha* 102a7–103a5:

bcom ldan 'das gzhan yang byang chub sems dpa' dge ba'i bshes gnyen ltar bcos pa |[1] sdig pa'i grogs po gang dag de la bsdu ba'i dngos po rnams las 'dun pa zlog pa dang | sems can yongs su smin par bgyid pa las 'dun pa zlog pa dang | dam pa'i chos yongs su bzung ba las 'dun pa zlog pa dang | bsod nams kyi tshogs las 'dun pa zlog pa dang | rab tu dben pa la sbyor ba dang | don nyung zhing bgyid pa nyung ba la sbyor ba dang | nyan thos dang | rang sangs rgyas dang ldan pa'i bka' mchid de la rgyun tu mang du ston pa dang | theg pa chen po dang ldan pa'i bka' mchid de la mi ston pa dag la brnyen[2] cing rten |[3] bsten te bsnyen bkur bgyid pa dang | gang gi tshe byang chub sems dpa' dben par gnas pas theg pa chen po las ldang ba de'i tshe |[1] byang chub sems dpa'[4] gdon mi za bar zhal ta byed par bya'o zhes byang chub sems dpa' zhal ta bgyid pa'i dri ma la sbyor la | gang gi tshe byang chub sems dpa' zhal ta bgyid pa'i dri ma la sbyor ba de'i tshe[5] dben pa la sbyor zhing mtshan ma dang bcas pa dang |[1] rgyu ba[6] dang bcas pa'i bzod pa'i sa nye bar ston |[7] byang chub sems dpa'i las yang dag par |[8] yang dag phul gang lags pa de dag de la mi ston to || byang chub sems dpa'i las yang dag par[9] yang dag phul de dag gang lags she na | bcom ldan 'das bcu po 'di dag ni byang chub sems dpa'i las yang dag pa yang dag phul lags so || bcu po de dag gang zhe na | 'di lta ste | dad pa'i rtsa ba la rab tu gnas te | dge ba'i bshes gnyen rnams la bsnyen cing bsten te |[1] bsnyen bkur bgyid pa dang | mgo dang gos la zhugs 'bar ba bzhin du dge ba'i chos ci zhes yongs su tshol ba dang | dge ba'i chos la 'dun pa la gnas te yang dag pa'i brtson pa mi 'dor ba dang | bag mchis[10] par las bgyis pa chung[11] mi gzon pa dang | bdag ba de ba la mi chags par rtag par rgyun tu sems can yongs su smin par bgyid pa dang | lus dang srog la mi lta bar dam pa'i chos yongs su 'dzin pa dang | mtshan dang dpe byad bzang po dang |[1] sangs rgyas kyi zhing yongs su sbyangs[12] pa'i slad du |[1]

bsod nams kyi tshogs yongs su tshol bas mi ngoms pa dang | gzungs dang spobs pa rab tu thob par bgyid[13] ba'i slad du |[1] ye shes kyi tshogs yongs su tshol ba dang | so so'i skye bo thams cad kyi sas mi gos par bgyi ba'i slad du |[1] shes rab kyi pha rol tu phyin pa bsgom[14] pa dang | nyan thos dang |[1] rang sangs rgyas thams cad kyi sa las shin tu bzla ba'i slad du |[1] thabs la mkhas pa yongs su tshol ba ste | bcom ldan 'das chos[15] bcu po de dag ni |[1] byang chub sems pa'i las yang dag pa yang dag phul lags te | gang dag la byang chub sems dpas bslabs[16] par bgyi ba de dag de la mi ston pa dang | de la 'di skad du byang chub ni |[1] byang chub sems dpa' brtson 'grus brtsams pa'i yin gyi |[1] le lo can gyi ma yin no || gal te khyod bskal pa brgyad dam bcus |[1] bla na med pa yang dag par rdzogs pa'i byang chub mngon par rdzogs par sangs ma rgyas na |[1] phyis khyod bla na med pa yang dag par rdzogs pa'i byang chub mngon par rdzogs par 'tshang rgya bar mi nus so zhes mchi la | bcom ldan 'das de la byang chub sems dpa' gang sgyid lug nas 'bras bu thob par bgyid pa'i gnas mchis na | bcom ldan 'das 'di ni byang chub sems dpa'i dge ba'i bshes gnyen ltar bcos pa'i bdud kyi lcags kyu ste bcu pa'o ||

1) D ø | 2) D bsnyen 3) D ø rten | 4) D dpas 5) D | 6) D ø, *but space with three tsegs* 7) D gyi *for* | 8) D pa *for* par | 9) D pa 10) D bgyid 11) D chud 12) D sbyang 13) D bgyi 14) D sgom 15) D ø chos 16) D bslab

In Chinese, there seems to be only a general similarity with a few sentences in T. 397 (5) (XIII) 71c (*juan* 11).

6. *Cīvaravastu* of the Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya. Dutt 1939–1959: iii101.7–11. Re-edited from the facsimile in Raghu Vira and Lokesh Chandra 1974: 263a3–4 (838), with the assistance of Klaus Wille:

uktaṁ bhadanta bhagavatā paṁcānuśaṁsā saṁmārjane katame paṁca | ātmanaś cittaṁ prasīdati parasya cittaṁ prasīdati | devatā āttamanaso bhavanti | prā**sā**dikasaṁvarttanīyaṁ kuśalamūlam upacinoti kāyasya bhedāt\ | sugatau svargaloke deveṣūpapadyata iti ,

D 1, *'dul ba, ga* 94a1–2; S 3, *'dul ba, ga* 121a2:

bcom ldan 'das kyis phyag dar byed pa la yon tan lnga yod de | lnga gang zhe na | bdag nyid kyi sems dang bar 'gyur ba dang | gzhan gyi sems dang bar 'gyur ba dang | lha rnams yid dga' bar 'gyur ba dang | mdzes par 'gyur ba'i dge ba'i rtsa ba sogs par 'gyur ba dang | lus zhig nas bde 'gro mtho ris kyi 'jig rten gyi lha rnams su skye bar 'gyur ro zhes bka' stsal to ||

Virtually the identical text is found in the *Śayanāsanavastu* (Gnoli 1978a: 37.27–38.3).

7. *Maitreyamahāsiṁhanāda*. S 11 (23), *dkon brtsegs, ca* 206b1–3; D 67, *dkon brtsegs, ca* 106a7–b1; P 760 (23), *dkon brtsegs, zi* 102a5–7:

’od srung[1] de la dge sbyong[2] gi las gang zhe na | ’od srung ngas[3] las gnyis po bsam gtan dang |[4] kha ton bya ba bstan pa gang dag[5] yin pa[6] dag ste | las de gnyis kyang lam la ’jug par bya ba’i phyir[7] bstan par zad kyi |[8] de dag kyang shin tu mtha’ thug pa dang | shin tu mthar phyin pa ni[9] ma yin no || ’od srung las gang las zad par bya ba’i phyir[10] ’jug pa de ni dge sbyong gi las yin te |

1) S srungs *for* srung, *and below* 2) S slong *for* sbyong 3) P des *for* ngas 4) S – | 5) P – dag 6) D + de 7) P + | 8) D – | 9) S – ni 10) P + |

T. 310 (23) (XI) 512a13–16 (*juan* 89):

何等名爲比丘之業。迦葉、如上所説沙門之業、則有二種。一者。修禪。二者。習誦。如是説者、爲入道故、非究竟説。迦葉、若有作業能盡業者、名沙門業。

8. *Ratnarāśi-sūtra*, with citations from the *Śikṣāsamuccaya*. Text established in Silk 1994: 437–454 (which see for further details): Tabo (A) 182b11–184b6; Berlin Kanjur 52.8, *dkon brtsegs, cha* 165a3–169a1; D 88, *dkon brtsegs, cha* 163a2–165b6; Phug brag Kanjur 75, *dkon brtsegs, cha* 217b3–221b2; Jang sa tham Kanjur 343, *dkon brtsegs, cha* 176a5–179a6; London Kanjur 643.44, *dkon brtsegs, cha* 180a8–183b3; Tokyo Kanjur 33.43, *dkon brtsegs, cha* 220b8–224a8; Narthang Kanjur 76, *dkon brtsegs, cha* 279b7–284b5; P 760.45, *dkon brtsegs, ’i* 159a5–162b1; S 11.44, *dkon brtsegs, cha* 256b5–269b4:

1) de nas bcom ldan ’das la tshe dang ldan pa ’od srung chen pos ’di skad ces gsol to || bcom ldan ’das dge slong ji lta bus zhal ta bgyi ba lags | bcom ldan ’das kyis bka’ stsal pa | ’od srung ngas zhal ta bya bar gnang ba’i dge slong gnyis te | gnyis gang zhe na | dge slong yongs su dag pa ’jig rten pha rol tu kha na ma tho bas ’jigs par lta ba las kyi rnam par smin pa la rton pa | ’dzem pa dang ldan zhing ’gyod pa dang ldan pa dang | gang yang zag pa zad pa dgra bcom par gyur pa ste | ’od srung dge slong ma nyams pa ’di gnyis zhal ta byed par ngas gnang ngo ||

2) de ci’i phyir zhe na | ’od srung legs par gsungs pa’i chos ’dul ba ’di la rigs sna tshogs las rab tu byung ba | sems kyi mos pa sna tshogs dang ldan pa | spong ba’i phyir rnal ’byor sna tshogs la gnas pa | kha

cig ni dgon pa pa zhi ba'i mal stan lanmngon par dga' ba | kha cig ni bsod snyoms pa | kha cig ni grong 'dab na gnas pa | kha cig ni 'tsho ba yongs su dag pa | kha cig ni mang du thos pa la mngon par brtson pa | kha cig ni chos smra ba | kha cig ni 'dul ba 'dzin pa | kha cig ni ma mo 'dzin pa | kha cig ni grong dang | grong khyer dang | grong rdal dang | yul 'khor dang | pho brang 'khor dag tu zhugs nas chos ston pa ste | sems can gzhan dag gi sems kyi spyod pa rnams bsrung dka' ba'i phyir ro || 'od srung de la dge slong zhal ta byed pas dge slong gi dge 'dun thams cad kyi sems mgu bar bya'o ||

Śikṣ. MS 32b5 = Bendall 1897–1902: 55.8: tatra vaiyāpr̥tyakareṇa bhikṣuṇā sarvvabhikṣusaṁghasya cittam abhirādhayitavyaṁ

3) 'od srung de la dge slong dgon pa pa bas mtha'i mal stan pa gang yin pa de dag ni dge slong zhal ta byed pas yongs su bsko bar mi bya'o || zhal ta byed pas dge slong dgon pa pa de dag bsrung bar bya ste | dus ma yin bar gsol bar mi bya | dus ma yin bar gtang bar mi bya'o || 'od srung gal te dge slong dgon pa pa la dge 'dun gyi bya bar gtogs pa slob pa'i las res bab na | dge slong zhal ta byed pa des las de bdag nyid kyis bya'o || yang na dge slong gzhan zhig bskos la las de byed du gzhug ste | dge slong dgon pa pa la gnod par mi bya'o ||

Śikṣ MS 32b5–7 = Bendall 1897–1902: 55.8–12: tatra ye bhikṣava āraṇyakāḥ prāntaśayyāsanikās teṣāṁ vaiyāpr̥tyakare**ṇa** bhikṣuṇā sarvveṇa sarvvaṁ na karmasamutthānaṁ dātavyaṁ | yadi punar āraṇyakasya bhikṣoḥ saṁghaparyāpannaṁ śaikṣakaṁ karma prāpnuyāt\ | etena vaiyāvr̥tyakareṇa bhikṣuṇā 'tmanaiva tat kartavyaṁ | anyataro vā **bhi**kṣur adhyeṣyo na punaḥ sa āraṇyako bhikṣur utpīḍayitavyas

4) 'od srung de la dge slong bsod snyoms spyod pa gang yin pa de la dge slong zhal ta byed pa des kha zas bsod pa bgo bsha' bya'o || 'od srung de la dge slong rnal 'byor spyod pa gang yin pa de dag la dge slong zhal ta byed pas 'thun pa'i 'tshog chas dang | na ba'i gsos sman dang | yo byad rnams sbyin par bya'o || dge slong rnal 'byor spyod pa des phyogs ga la gnas pa'i sa phyogs der dge slong zhal ta byed pa des sgra chen po dang | skad drag po mi dbyung zhing byed du yang mi gzhug go | dge slong zhal ta byed pas dge slong rnal 'byor spyod pa de bsrung zhing mal cha yang sbyar bar bya'o || kha zas bsod pa dang | yi gar 'ong ba dang | rnal 'byor spyod pa'i sa dang 'thun pa'i bza' ba dang bca' ba rnams sbyin par bya'o || dge slong de la dge slong 'di ni de bzhin gshegs pa'i bstan pa rton pa'i phyir gnas

pa yin te | de la bdag gis rjes su ’thun pa’i yo byad thams cad mang du sbyar bar bya’o snyam du shin tu phangs pa’i ’du shes bskyed bar bya’o ||

Śikṣ. MS 32b7–33a2 = Bendall 1897–1902: 55.12–18: tatra yo bhikṣuḥ piṇḍacāriko bhavati | tasya tena vaiyāpṛtyakareṇa bhikṣuṇā praṇītabhojaneṣu samvibhāgaḥ karttavyaḥ | tatra kāśyapa yo bhikṣur yogā**cā**ro bhavati • tasya tena vaiyāvṛtyakareṇa bhikṣuṇā ’nulomikāny upakaraṇāny upasaṁharttavyāni • glānapratyayabhaiṣajyapariṣkārāś ca | yasmiṁś ca pradeśśe sa yogācāro bhikṣuḥ prativasati tasmin pradeśe noccaśabdaḥ karttavya**ḥ** | rakṣitavyo vaiyāvṛtyakareṇa bhikṣuṇā yogācāro bhikṣuḥ | śayyāsanopastambhanāsya karttavyā | praṇītāni ca saṁpreyāṇi yogācārabhūmyanukūlāni khādanīyabhojanīyāny upanāmayita-vyāni | pe |

5) ’od srung de la dge slong mang du thos pa la mngon par brtson pa gang yin pa de dag la dge slong zhal ta byed pas lung nos shig | lhogs shig | kha ton gyis shig | kho bo ni khyod kyi rim gro byed pa yin gyis | khyod ji lta ji lta bur mang du thos par gyur pa de lta de lta bur dge slong gi dge ’dun mdzes par ’gyur bar gyis shig | ’dug la brjod pas mdzes par gyis shig | bdag nyid kyi shes rab kyang mchog tu ’gyur bar gyis shig ces spro ba bskyed par bya’o || ’od srung de la dge slong zhal ta byed pas de dag dus ma yin par gtang bar mi bya | las su bsko bar mi bya’o || dge slong zhal ta byed pa des dge slong mang du thos pa de dag bsrung bar bya’o ||

Śikṣ. MS 33a2–3 = Bendall 1897–1902: 55.18–56.1: ye bhikṣavo **bā**huśrutye ’bhiyuktā bhavanti teṣām utsāho dātavyaḥ | yāvat te pi rakṣitavyāḥ |

6) ’od srung de la chos smra ba’i dge slong gang yin pa de dag dge slong zhal ta byed pas las su mi bsko bar bya’o || grong dang grong khyer dang | grong rdal dang | yul ’khor dang | rgyal po’i pho brang ’khor dag tu ’jug tu bcug la chos ’chad du gzhug go | chos nyan pa dag bsko bar bya’o || ’khor gyi dkyil ’khor rnam par dag par bya’o || ’bel ba’i chos kyi gtam gyi phyir dkyil ’khor dug zhag par bya’o || chos smra ba’i dge slong la dge slong gang dag gnod pa byed pa’i dge slong de dag dge slong zhal ta byed pas bzlog par bya’o || dge slong zhal ta byed pas chos smra ba’i dge slong la rtag tu bsu bar bya | legs so zhes bya ba mang du bya’o ||

Śikṣ. MS 33a3–4 = Bendall 1897–1902: 56.1–3: ye dhārmakathikā bhikṣavo bhaviṣyanti | teṣāṁ pratīhāradharmatā karttavyā | yāvad

dhārmmaśravaṇikāś codyojayitavyāḥ parṣanmaṇḍalaṁ parisaṁ**stā**payitavyaṁsāṁkaṭṭhyamaṇḍalaṁ viśodhayitavyaṁ yāvat sādhukārabahulena cāsya bhavitavyaṁ | pe |

7) ’od srung de la dge slong gang dag ’dul ba ’dzin pa dang | ma mo ’dzin par gyur pa de dag gi gan du dge slong zhal ta byed pa de song la ji ltar na bdag rma med cing ma nyams pa dang | ji ltar na bdag ltung ba med pa’i chos kyis zhal ta bya zhes yongs su dri bar bya’o || de nas ’dul ba ’dzin pa dang | ma mo ’dzin pa’i dge slong de dag gis dge slong zhal ta byed pa de’i bsam pa rig nas de’i bya ba dang | ’byung ba gang yin pa dang | byed pa gang yin pa de bstan par bya’o ||

8) dge slong zhal ta byed pas ’dul ba ’dzin pa dang | ma mo ’dzin pa’i dge slong de dag la phangs par bya ba dang | dad pa dang | gus pa dang | zhe sa rab tu bskyed par bya’o || dge ’dun gyi rnyed pa gang yin pa de dge slong zhal ta byed pas dus dus su dge slong gi dge ’dun la dbul bar bya’i | dge ’dun gyi rnyed pa bsags shing sba bar mi bya ste | ji ltar rnyed pa bzhin du sbyin par bya | ma bskul bar sbyin par bya | gnod pa med par sbyin par bya’o || des ’dun pa dang | zhe sdang dang | gti mug dang | ’jigs pas ’gro bar mi bya’o ||

9) dge slong gi dge ’dun la rton par bya’i | khyim pa’i phyogs la rton par mi bya’o || dge ’dun gyi bya ba la rton par bya’i | bdag gi bya ba la rton par mi bya’o || dngos po gang la yang dbang bya ba’i ’du shes bskyed par mi bya’i | bya ba ji tsam du chung pa yang dge ’dun gyi gros bzhin bya zhing rang dgar mi bya’o ||

Śikṣ. MS 33a4–5 = Bendall 1897–1902: 56.3–5: na kvacid vastuni aiśvaryasaṁjñotpādayitavyā | kiyat parīttam api kāryaṁ saṁghamatena karttavyaṁ | na svamatena yā**va**n

10) dge ’dun gyi ’am | phyogs bzhi’i dge ’dun gyi ’am | mchod rten gyi yo byad gang ci yang rung ste | ji lta ba bzhin du gzhag par bya ste | dge ’dun gyi dang phyogs bzhi’i dge ’dun gyi dang bsre bar mi bya’o || phyogs bzhi’i dge ’dun gyi rnyed pa yang dge ’dun gyi dang bsre bar mi bya’o || dge ’dun gyi dang phyogs bzhi’i dge ’dun gyi rnyed pa mchod rten gyi dang bsre bar mi bya’o || mchod rten gyi rnyed pa yang dge ’dun gyi dang phyogs bzhi’i dge ’dun gyi dang bsre bar mi bya’o || gal te phyogs bzhi’i dge ’dun la brel phongs su gyur la | dge ’dun gyi rnyed pa che bar gyua na | dge slong zhal ta

byed pas dge slong gi dge ’dun bsdus la gros ’thun par bgyis te | dge ’dun gyi rnyed pa de las phyogs bzhi’i dge ’dun la bshugs par bya’o ||

Śikṣ. MS 33a5–6 = Bendall 1897–1902: 56.5–8: na sāṁghikaś cāturdiśasāṁghikena saṁsr̥ṣṭaḥ kartavyaḥ | evaṁ viparyayād evaṁ staupikena sahānyonyasaṁsargapratiṣedhaḥ | yadi cāturdiśe saṁghe vaikalyaṁ bhavet sāṁghikaś ca lābha utsado bhavet tena vaiyāpr̥**tya**kareṇa bhikṣuṇā bhikṣusaṁgham ekamānasaṁ kr̥tvā sāṁghikalābhāc cāturdiśasāṁghikakāryaṁ karttavyaṁ |

11) gal te de bzhin gshegs pa’i mchod rten zhig ral du gyur la | dge ’dun gyi dang phyogs bzhi’i dge ’dun gyi rnyed pa che bar gyur na | dge slong zhal ta byed pas dge slong gi dge ’dun thams cad bsdus la gros ’thun par bgyis te | ’di skad ces de bzhin gshegs pa’i mchod rten ’di ni zhig ral du gyur la | dge ’dun gyi dang phyogs bzhi’i dge ’dun gyi rnyed pa ni che bar gyur na | gal te tshe dang ldan pa rnams gnod pa med cing dad pa dang ldan la bzod cing gnang na | bdag gis dge ’dun gyi dang | phyogs bzhi’i dge ’dun gyi rnyed pa ’di las dngos po cung zad cig khyer te | de bzhin gshegs pa’i mchod rten ’di bcos par bya’o zhes brjod par bya’o || gal te dge ’dun gyis gnang na | dge slong zhal ta byed pa des de bzhin du bya’o || ci ste dge ’dun gyis ma gnang na | dge slong zhal ta byed pa des sbyin pa po dang | sbyin bdag rnams la gsol ba thob la de bzhin gshegs pa’i mchod rten gso bar bya’o ||

Śikṣ. MS 323a6 = Bendall 1897–1902: 56.8–9: evaṁ stūpe pi pralugne ’yam eva vidhir dāyakā[*n dā*]napatīn vā samādāpya pratisaṁskarttavya ity ājñā

12) ’od srung gal te mchod rten gyi rnyed pa ji ltar mang du gyur du zin kyang | dge slong zhal ta byed pas dge ’dun dang phyogs bzhi’i dge ’dun la bzhugs par mi bya’o || de ci’i phyir zhe na | dad cing dang ba mang po dag gis mchod rten la phul ba ni tha na ras kyi kha tshar gcig tsam gang yin pa de yang lha dang bcas pa’i ’jig rten gyi mchod rten yin na | rin po che ’am | rin po cher smos pa dag lta smos kyang ci dgos | mchod rten la gos phul ba gang yin pa de ni de bzhin gshegs pa’i mchod rten de nyid du rlung dang nyi ma dang | char pas dengs kyang bla’i | mchod rten la phul ba’i gos dbyig gam dbyig gi rin du bsgyur bar mi bya’o || de ci’i phyir zhe na | mchod rten gyi ni rin thang cung zad kyang med la mchod rten ni cis kyang brel ba med pa’i phyir ro ||

MS 33a6–b2 = Bendall 1897–1902: 56.9–14: yadi punaḥ **kā**yapa kiyadbahur api staupiko lābho bhavet sa vaiyāpṛtyakareṇa na saṁghe na cāturdiśasaṁghe upanāmayitavyaḥ | tat kasmād dhetor yā staupikā antaśa ekadaśāpi śrāddhaiḥ prasādabahulair niryātitā bhavati | sā sa**dev**akasya lokasya caityaṁ kaḥ punarvvādo ratnam vā ratnasammataṁ vā • yac ca stūpe cīvaraṁ niryātitaṁ bhavati tat tatraiva tathāgatacaitye vātātapavṛṣṭibhiḥ parikṣayaṁ gacchatu | na puna staupikañ cīvaraṁ hiraṇyamūlyena pariva**rta**yitavyaṁ | na hi staupikasya kaścid argho nāpi stūpasya kenacid vaikalyaṁ

13) ’od srung dge slong zhal ta byed pas de ltar yongs su dag par bya ste | des dkon mchog gsum gyi dang ma ’bags par bya’o || bdag gi rnyed bas chog shes par bya’o || dkon mchog gsum gyis byin gyis brlabs pa’i dngos po rnams la bdag gir ’du shes mi bya’o ||

14) ’od srung dge slong zhal ta byed pa rab tu sdang ba’i sems dang ldan pa gang la la zhig gis tshul khrims dang ldan pa | yon tan dang ldan pa | sbyin gnas rnams la sems khros sam | dbang byed cing bsgo blag byed na | de mi dge ba’i las des sems can dmyal bar ’gro bar ’gyur ro || gal te mi’i ’jig rten du ’ongs na yang bran dang gzhan gyi las byed par ’gyur ba dang | khu tshur dang | thal lcag dang | lag cha snyems pas brdegs pa dang phrad par ’gyur ro ||

Śikṣ. MS 33b2–3 = Bendall 1897–1902: 56.14–17: yo hi kaścit kāśyapa vaiyāpṛtyakaro bhikṣū ruṣṭacittaḥ śīlavatān dakṣiṇīyānām aiśvaryād ājñaptin dadāti sa tenākuśalena karmaṇā **na**rakagāmī bhavatīti | yadi manuṣyalokam āgacchati dāso bhavati parakarmakaro lābhī ca bhavati • khaṭacapeṭapracaṇḍaprahārāṇāṁ | pe |

15) ’od srung gzhan yang dge slong zhal ta byed pa dge ’dun gyi bya ba las ’das te | rang dgar dge slong rnams la dbang byed cing bsgo ba dang | chad pas gcod pa dang | ’jigs par byed pa dang | sdigs pa dang | dus ma yin par mngag pa dang | dus ma yin par bsgo ba byed na de mi dge ba’i las des nyi tshe ba’i sems can dmyal ba phur pa mang po zhes bya ba der skye bar ’gyur te | der skyes nas lus la lcags phur brgya stong zug cing | de dag ’bar | rab tu ’bar la | kun tu rab tu mched cing ’bar bar ’gyur ro ||

Śikṣ. MS 33b3–4 = Bendall 1897–1902: 56.17–57.3: daṇḍakarmabhayatarjitaṁ bhikṣuṁ karoty akālapreṣaṇam akāla-

jñaptiṁ **da**dāti | sa tenākuśalena karmaṇā bahuśaṅkur nāma pratyekanarakas tatrāsyopapattir bhavati | yāvat sahasraviddhaḥ kāyo bhavati | ādīptaḥ | pradīptaḥ saṁprajvalitaḥ | pe |

16) des tshul khrims dang ldan pa | yon tan dang ldan pa | sbyin gnas rnams la sdigs shing ngag gi las gdug pa smras par gyur pa gang yin pa des de der skyes nas lce'i dbang po'i khyon dpag tshad brgya par 'gyur zhing | de'i lce'i dbang po de la lcags phur brgya stong rab tu 'bab cing de dag kyang 'bar rab tu 'bar | kun tu rab tu 'bar la | kun tu rab tu mched cing 'bar te mer 'gyur ro || de ci'i phyir zhe na | 'di ltar des bsdigs shing ngag gi las gdug pa smras par gyur pa'i phyir ro ||

Śikṣ. MS 33b4–5 = Bendall 1897–1902: 57.3–4: yojanaśatavistārap ramāṇā **ji**hvā bhavati | tasya tatra jihvendriye bahūni śaṅkuśatasahasrāṇi ādiptāni • ayasmayāni nikhātāni bhavanti |

17) 'od srung dge slong zhal ta byed pa gang la las dge 'dun gyi rnyed pa 'dus shing 'dus pa bzhag ste | dus dus su mi sbyin zhing tho btsams la gtses nas sbyin pa dang | kha cig byin | kha cig ma byin | kha cig la byin | kha cig la ma byin na | de mi dge ba'i las des yi dags kyi skye gnas rkyag 'jim byin pa nub ces bya ba der skye bar 'gyur ro || de der skyes nas yi dags gzhan gyis kha zas blangs te de la bstan na | de bstan pa'i tshe mig gnyi ga mi 'dzums par zas de la lta zhing bkres pa dang skom pas nyen pa'i sdug bsngal gyi tshor ba myong gi | lo brgya stong du yang zas de ni thob par mi 'gyur ro || ji ste brgya la brgya lam na zas de thob kyang ngan skyugs dang rnag khrag tu 'gyur ro || de ci'i phyir zhe na | 'di ltar des tshul khrims dang ldan pa | yon tan dang ldan pa | sbyin gnas rnams mgu bar ma byas shing | rang gi rnyed pas chog mi shes par gyur pa'i phyir ro ||

Śikṣ. MS 33b5–34a1 = Bendall 1897–1902: 57.4–10: yo hi kaścit kāśyapa vaiyapr̥tyakaro bhikṣur āgatāgataṁ sāṁghikaṁ lābhaṁ sannidhiṁ karoti • **na** kālānukālaṁ dadāti | udvaśyāpayitvā viheṭhayitvā dadāti | keṣāñcin na dadāti sa tenākuśalamūlena jaṁghā nāma gūthamr̥ttikāpretayonis tatrāsyopapattir bhavati | tatrā-syānye pretā bhojanaṁ gr̥hītvā**pa**darśayanti | sa udvaśyamānas tadbhojam animiṣābhyāṁ netr[o]bhyām paśyamānaḥ kṣutpipāśāpari- gato duṣkhām vedanām vetti na ca varṣasahasreṇāpi tasya bhojanasya lābhī bhavati | yad api kadācit karhicid bhojanaṁ labdhaṁ **bha**vati • tad uccāraṁ bhavati pūyaśoṇitam veti ||

18) ’od srung dge slong zhal ta byed pa gang la las dge ’dun gyi ’am | phyogs bzhi’i dge ’dun gyi ’am | mchod rten gyi tshol bar byas na | de’i rnam par smin pa ni ngas bskal pa bgrangs pas kyang brjod kyis mi lang ngo ||

19) ’od srung dge slong zhal ta byed pa gang la las nyes dmigs kyi gnas ’di lta bu ’di dag thos nas | khro ’am | gshe ’am | gnod par sems sam | khong khro ba skyed na | de ni gsor mi rung ngo zhes ngas bshad do || ’od srung de lta bas na dam pa’i chos ’di lta bu ’di thos nas dge slong zhal ta byed pas lus dang ngag dang yid yongs su dag par bya’o || bdag dang gzhan bsrung bar bya’o ||

20) ’od srung dge slong zhal ta byed pa rang gi sha la za yang bla’i | dkon mchog gsum gyis byin gyis brlabs pa’i lhung bzed dam | chos gos sam | bsod snyoms sam | na ba’i gsos sman nam | yo byad yongs su spyad par ni mi bya’o ||

T. 310 (44) (XI) 643a13–644a26 (*juan* 113), but the text quoted here is that established in Silk 1994: 591–605, and see there for the quotation in the Chinese translation of the *Śikṣāsamuccaya*, T. 1636 (XXXII) 86a23–c6 (*juan* 4), and in numerous other texts:

1) 爾時。摩訶迦葉白佛言。世尊、云何比丘能營衆事。佛告。迦葉、我聽二種比丘得營衆事。何等二。一者。能淨持戒。二者。畏於後世喻如金剛。復有二種。何等二。一者。識知業報。二者。有諸慚愧及以悔心。復有二種。何等二。一者。阿羅漢。二者。能修八背捨者。迦葉、如是二種比丘。我聽營事自無瘡疣。

2) 何以故。迦葉、護他人意此事難故。迦葉、於佛法中種種出家種種性種種心種種解脱種種斷結。或有阿蘭若。或有乞食。或有樂住山林。或有樂近聚落清淨持戒。或有能離四扼。或有勤修多聞。或有辯説諸法。或有善持戒律。或有善持毘尼儀式。或有遊諸城邑聚落爲人説法。有如是等諸比丘僧。營事比丘善取如是諸人心相。

3) 迦葉、若阿蘭若比丘樂空閑處。營事比丘一切役使不應令作。有時阿蘭若比丘在比丘僧次役使而營事比丘應當代作。若自不作應倩他人令代爲之。不應役使阿蘭若比丘。若非行道時可少令作。

4) 迦葉、若有乞食比丘。彼營事比丘於乞食比丘應與好食。若有比丘能離四扼營事比丘隨所須物應當供給。所謂。衣服飲食臥具醫藥。若離扼比丘所住之處。營事比丘於其住處不應高聲大喚亦不令他高聲大喚。欲防護離扼比丘故。營事比丘於離扼比丘應生尊敬如世尊想。生如是念。如是比丘於佛法中能作法柱當隨所須而供給之。

5) 迦葉、若有勤修多聞比丘。營事比丘應當勸喩作如是言。大德。勤修多聞讀誦令利。我當爲諸大德供給使令。若諸大德勤修多聞。於比丘僧中是好瓔珞能昇高座。廣説正法亦自生智慧。營事比丘不應非時役使。應當擁護令修多聞。

6)迦葉、若有説法比丘。營事比丘應事事供給。應將説法比丘。至城邑聚落。勸喩諸人令就聽法。説法之處亦應供給爲説法人敷好高座。若有比丘強自以力欲壞説法者。營事比丘應往和解。亦應數往説法人所稱及言。善哉。

7) 迦葉、若有比丘善持戒律。善持毘尼義。營事比丘應往其所數數問義。我云何營事令不得罪。自無所損。不害於他。持毘尼義比丘應觀營事者心。隨所營事而爲説法。所謂。是應作。是不應作。

8) 營事比丘於持律人所一心生信禮敬供養。若比丘僧所有分物應當隨時供給。於僧不應藏擧隨僧所須。應當分與。應與時與。不惡心與。不以非法與。非欲心與。非瞋心與。非癡心與。非畏心與。

9) 隨僧法行非隨在家行。隨僧制行非自隨制行。不於僧物生自在想乃至小事。與僧共斷非自在斷。

10) 若所用物。所謂。常住僧物。及與佛物。若招提僧物。彼營事比丘應當分別。常住僧物不應與招提僧。招提僧物不應與常住僧。常住僧物不應與招提僧物共雜。招提僧物不與常住僧物共雜。常住僧物招提僧物不與佛物共雜。佛物不與常住僧物招提僧物共雜。若常住僧物多而招提僧有所須者。營事比丘應集僧行籌索欲。若僧和合。應以常住僧物分與招提僧。

11) 迦葉、若如來塔。或有所須若欲敗壞者。若常住僧物若招提僧物多。營事比丘應集僧行籌索欲作如是言。是佛塔壞。今有所須此常住僧物招提僧物多。大德僧聽。若僧時到僧忍聽。若僧不惜。所得施物若常住僧物若招提僧物。我今持用修治佛塔。若僧和合營事比丘應以僧物修治佛塔。若僧不和合營事比丘應餘勸化在家人輩求索財物修治佛塔。

12) 迦葉、若佛物多者。營事比丘不得以佛物分與常住僧及招提僧。何以故。於此物中應生世尊想。佛所有物乃至一線皆是施主信心施佛。是故諸天世人於此物中生佛塔想而況寶物。若於佛塔先以衣施。此衣於佛塔中寧令風吹雨爛破盡。不應以此衣貿易寶物。何以故。如來塔物無人能與作價者。又佛無所須故。

13)迦葉、有如是善淨。營事人者。三寶之物不應令雜。又於自利養心常知足。三寶物中不生我所有想。

14) 迦葉、營事比丘若生瞋心而於持戒大德人所右遶禮敬之者。以自在故驅令役使。是故營事比丘以瞋心縁故。墮大地獄。若得爲人作他奴僕。常爲其主苦驅役使。人所鞭打。

15) 復次迦葉、若營事比丘以自在故。更作重制。過僧常限謫罰比丘。非時令作。是營事比丘以此不善根故。墮於多釘小地獄中。生此中已。以百千釘釘挓其身。其身熾然出大火焰如大火聚。

16) 若於持戒有大德者。以重事怖之以瞋心語故。彼營事比丘生地獄中。其所得舌長五百由旬以百千釘而釘其舌一一釘中出大火焰。

17) 迦葉、若營事比丘數得僧物慳惜藏舉。或非時與僧。或復難與。或困苦與。或少與或不與。或有與者或不與者。營事比丘以此不善根故。墮穢惡餓鬼常食糞丸。此人命終當生是中。爾時。更有餓鬼以食示之而復不與。此鬼爾時悕望欲得諦視此食目不曾眴。受飢渴苦。於百千歲中常不得食。或時得食變爲糞屎或作膿血。何以故。有持戒人人所敬禮僧所有物以自在故而難與之。

18) 迦葉、若營事比丘以常住僧物若招提僧物及以佛物輙自雜用。得大苦報。若受一劫。若過一劫。何以故。以侵三寶物故。

19) 迦葉、若營事比丘聞如是罪。知如是罪。而故生瞋心於持戒者。我今說此諸佛世尊所不能治。迦葉、是故營事比丘聞如是非法罪已。應當善護身口意業。自護亦護他。

20) 迦葉、營事比丘。寧自噉身肉。終不雜用三寶之物作衣鉢飲食。

9. *Sūryagarbha-sūtra*. D 257, *mdo sde, za* 106b5–7; S 108, *mdo sde, na* 186a2–5:

de nas bcom ldan ’das la[1] rgyal po gzugs can snying pos ’di skad ces gsol to || btsun pa bcom ldan ’das zhal ta pa zhes bgyi lags na[1] bcom ldan ’das ji tsam gyis na[1] zhal ta par gdags pas[1] gdags par mdzad pa lags | bcom ldan ’das kyis bka’ stsal pa | rgyal po chen po dge slong gnyis zhal ta par ngas gnang ngo || gnyis gang yin[2] zhe na | gang yang rnam par thar pa brgyad la sgom pa’i dgra bcom pa dang | gang yang dge slong slob pa rgyun du zhugs pa yin te | rgyal po chen po dge slong ’di gnyis zhal ta pa’i las byed par ngas gnang ngo ||

1) S ø | 2) S ø yin

T. 397 (14) (XIII) 238c27–239a2 (*juan* 34):

佛言大王。有二種人堪持僧事、守護僧物。何者爲二。一者。具八解脱阿羅漢人。二者。須陀洹等三果學人。此二種人堪知僧事、供養衆僧。諸餘比丘、或戒不具足、心不平等、不令是人爲知僧事。

T. 397 (13) (XIII) 216a25–28 (*juan* 31):

大王。僧物難掌。我今惟聽二人掌護。一者。羅漢比丘具八解脱。二者。須陀洹人。大王。除是二人更無有人掌護僧物。

10. *Sāgaramatiparipṛcchā*, cited in the *Śikṣāsamuccaya*. MS 26b5–27a1; Bendall 1897–1902: 41.15–42.1:

punar aparaṁ kulaputra ye te dharmbhāṇakā eṣām evaṁ rūpāṇāṁ sūtrāntānān deśayitāraḥ pratipattisārāś ca teṣām api dharmabhāṇakānāṁ yat sevanaṁ bhajanaṁ paryupāsanam utthānam upasthānaṁ gau**ra**vaṁ citrīkāraḥ śuśruṣā ārakṣā parigrahaś cīvarapiṇḍapātraśayanāsanaglānapratyayabhaiṣajyapariṣkāradānaṁ sādhukāradānaṁ svāmyārakṣā kuśalapakṣarakṣā varṇṇabhāṣaṇam avarṇṇa(praticchā)**da**natā ayam api saddharmaparigrahaḥ,

Śikṣ (Ś): D 3940, *dbu ma, khi* 29b2–4; P 5336, *dbu ma, ki* 36a3–6; sūtra (s): S 134, *mdo sde, ba* 75a6–b2; D 153, *mdo sde, pha* 52b2–4:

rigs kyi bu gzhan yang chos smra ba gang dag mdo sde ’di lta bu ’di dag ’dzin pa dang |[1] ston pa dang[2] sgrub pa snying por byed[3] pa’i chos smra ba de dag la gang bsnyen pa dang[2] brten[4] pa dang[2] bsnyen bkur byed pa dang[2] ldang[5] pa dang[2] rim gro byed pa dang | gus par byed pa dang | zhes byed pa dang | bsti stang byed pa dang | kun tu srung[6] ba dang | sbed pa dang | yongs su ’dzin pa dang | gos dang[2] zas dang[2] mal cha dang[2] na ba’i gsos sman dang[2] yo byad sbyin pa dang | legs so zhes bya ba sbyin pa dang | rje bo ltar kun tu bsrung[7] ba dang | dge ba kun tu bsrung[7] ba dang | bsngags pa brjod pa dang | mi snyen pa ’chab pa ’di yang dam pa’i chos yongs su ’dzin pa’o ||

1) ŚP ø | 2) s + | 3) s ø pa snying por byed 4) s bstan, ŚP bsten 5) ŚD ldan 6) ŚP bsrung 7) s srung

Chinese translations: T. 1636 (XXXII) 83c25–84a1 (*juan* 4); T. 400 (XIII) 496a20–25 (*juan* 9); T. 397 (5) (XIII) 59a7–13 (*juan* 9).

11. *Samanatapāsādikā*. Takakusu and Nagai 1924–1947: 253,29–33:

ārāmiko ti maṁ dhārehī ti na vevacanena paccakkhānaṁ hoti | kappiyakārako ti maṁ dhārehi veyyāvaccakaro appaharitakārako yāgubhājako phalabhājako khajjakabhājako ti maṁ dhārehī ti evaṁ ārāmikavevacanena sikkhāpaccakkānaṁ hoti.

In the Chinese translation of the *Samantapāsādikā*, the parallel is found in T. 1462 (XXIV) 721a4–6 (*juan* 7), trans Bapat and Hirakawa 1970: 192.

12. *Karmaśataka*, story 32, *srin*; D 340, *mdo sde, ha* 116b7–118b5; S 274, *mdo sde, ha* 170b2–173a4:

kun dga’ bo sngon byung ba ’das pa’i dus na | nyan thos dang rang sangs rgyas kyi sa las ’das pa | yang dag par rdzogs pa’i sangs

rgyas rig pa dang zhabs su ldan pa | bde bar gshegs pa | ’jig rten mkhyen pa | skyes bu gdul bya’i kha lo sgyur ba | bla na med pa | lha dang mi rnams kyi ston pa sangs rgyas bcom ldan ’das thams cad mchog ces bya ba ’jig rten du byung ste | de’i tshe khyim bdag gcig[1] gis yang dag par rdzogs pa’i sangs rgyas thams cad mchog gi bstan pa la dad pa rnyed de |[2] skyabs su ’gro ba dang |[2] blabs[3] pa’i gzhi rnams blangs nas des bsams pa |[2] bdag gis khyim na gnas pa gtang[4] la | yang dag par rdzogs pa’i sangs rgyas thams cad mchog gi bstan pa la rab tu ’byung ngo snyam du bsams nas |[2] khyim gyi ’khor btang ste | yang dag par rdzogs pa’i sangs rgyas thams cad mchog gi bstan pa la rab tu byung ngo || de der rab tu byung nas |[2] sde snod gsum bslabs te |[2] rig pa dang grol ba’i spobs pa dang ldan pa’i chos smra ba | zas dang |[2] skom pa dang |[2] mal cha dang |[2] stan dang |[2] nad gsos dang |[2] sman zong rnams rnyed par gyur nas |[2] des bsams pa | ma la bdag gis rnyed pa dang bkur sti’i sgo nas rnyed par bya ba rnyed pa des |[2] bdag gis tshangs pa mtshungs par spyod pa rnams la phan gdags gor ma chag snyam nas | sbyin bdag dang sbyin pa po rnams la bskul te | sangs rgyas dang |[2] chos dang |[2] dge ’dun la bsnyen bkur byed pa la zhugs so ||

de’i tshe nog ri zhes bya ba’i steng du slob pa dang mi slob pa’i dge ’dun bdun khri bdun stong dbyar gnas par dam bca’ bar ’dod de | de dag gis bsams pa | bdag gis zhal ta byed pa bskos te |[2] gang de[5] dbyar gnas par dam bca’ ’o snyam mo ||[6] bdag cag dge ’dun gyi bsnyen bkur byed nus pa su yod snyam nas | de dag gis bsams pa | sde snod gsum pa ’di ni kun la grags pa bsod nams chen po dang ldan pa | zas dang |[2] skom dang |[2] mal cha dang |[2] stan dang |[2] nad gsos dang |[2] sman zong rnams rnyed pa yin gyis | bdag cag gis ’di spro ba bskyed la |[2] ’di kho nas bdag cag gi zhal ta byas te |[2] dbyar gnas par dam bca’ ’o snyam nas |[2] de’i thad du song ste smras pa | btsun pa bdag cag dge slong bdun khri bdun stong nog ri’i steng du dbyar gnas par dam bca’ bar ’dod la | khyod kyis ni chos bzhin du dge ’dun gyi zhal ta byed nus na khyod spro bar gyis shig dang[7] khyod la brten te bdag cag dbyar gnas par dam bca’o[8] || sde snod gsum pas smras pa | khyed thugs ma bser cig dang |[2] bdag gis khyed kyi yo byad thams cad sbyar ro || de nas de thos ma thag tu dge slong de dag ri de’i steng du song nas |[2] sde snod gsum pa de kho na la brten te dbyar gnas par dam bcas so || de nas sde snod gsum pas bsams pa | bdag gis dge slong ’di snyed la thugs ma bser cig ces byas na |[9] gyin ’da’[10] ’dug pas mi nus kyis |[11] bdag song la

sbyin bdag dang sbyin pa po rnams la bskul te | dge 'dun gyi yo byad thams cad sbyar ro snyam du bsams nas |[2] snga dro sham thabs dang chos gos bgos te |[2] lhung bzed thogs nas |[2] spyod yul gyi grong du chas so ||

de'i tshe rgya mtsho chen po'i nang nas |[2] tshong pa lnga brgya tsam gru'i don grub ste lhags nas |[2] ri de dang thag mi ring ba zhig tu rdzas phog ste |[2] gnas bcas nas tshong pa rnams kyis ri de'i steng na dge slong phal po che 'khod pa mthong ngo || mthong nas kyang de dag la mchog tu dga' bar gyur to || dge slong zhal ta byed pa de yang de dag gi thad du song ste | de de dag gis mthong nas smras pa | btsun pa gar gshegs |[2] sde sdnod gsum pas smras pa | ri 'di'i steng na dge slong bdun khri bdun stong 'khod pa rnams bdag la brten te dbyar gnas par dam bcas pas na | de dag gi phyir sbyin bdag dang sbyin pa po rnams la bskul du 'gro'o || tshong pa rnams kyis smras pa | btsun pa thugs[12] bser bar ci yang bgyi mi 'tshal gyis |[2] bdag cag gis de dag gi yo byad thams cad sbyar bar 'tshal lo zhes byas nas | de dag gis de la gser dngul mang du phul nas smras pa | btsun pa khyod kyis deng slan chad[13] dge slong de dag la yo byad thams cad sbyor la | gal te gser dngul 'di dag gis 'tshal na ni legs | gal te ma 'tshal na[14] yang gser dngul gzhan yang ji tsam 'tshal ba de tsam bdag cag 'bul[15] lo || dbyar gnas[16] lags pa'i mjug tu yang na bza' dag dbul bar 'chal lo zhes byas so || de nas zhal ta byed pa des de ltar bgyi[17] zhes byas nas | gser dngul rnams khyer te gtsug lag khang du song nas[18] des gser dngul rnams bltas pa dang |[2] chags pa skyes nas |[2] des gser dngul rnams bskungs te | dge slong rnams la ni zas dang skom ngan pa stobs par byed do ||

de nas phyis dge slong de dag gis zhal ta byed pa de la bshad de | btsun pa bdag cag zas dang skom ngan pa 'di lta bus 'tsho mi nus so ||

des smras pa | bdag gi mthu ni de kho nar zad de | de las mi nus kyis |[2] gal te khyed des 'tsho mi nus na khyed bdag cag gis sbyin bdag dag bskul la 'tsho bar gyis shig ces byas so ||

de nas des[19] thos ma thag tu dge slong de dag gis tshong pa de dag la khyed kyis dge slong bdun khri bdun stong gi zas dang skom sbyar bar nus sam zhes smras pa dang |

tshong pa rnams kyis smras pa | btsun pa dag bdag cag gis 'phags pa zhal ta byed[20] pa la gser dngul mang po phul te | gal te 'di tsam gyis 'tshal na yang legs | gal te mi[21] 'tshal na yang gser dngul gzhan dbul bar 'tshal lo zhes bgyis na[22] | ci'i slad du des khyed la zas dang skom ngan pas gsol ces byas nas |

tshong pa de dag sde snod gsum pa'i thad du dong nas smras pa | btsun pa bdag cag gis gal te gser dngul 'di rnams kyis 'tshal na ni legs | gal te mi[21] 'tshal na yang gser dngul gzhan dbul lo zhes ma bgyis sam | ci'i slad du khyod kyis dge slong rnams la zas dang skom ngan pa gsol zhes byas so ||

de nas de thos ma thag tu zhal ta byed pa de skyengs nas khros te phyin chad[13] dge slong de dag gi zhal ta byed du ma btub bo ||

de nas dge slong rnams kyis |[2] de la smras pa | btsun pa bdag cag khyod la brten te dbyar gnas par dam bcas nas |[23] ci'i phyir khyod cang mi byed par 'dug | phyin chad[13] dge slong rnams kyi yo byad sbyar bar ma dad dam zhes byas pa dang |[2]

de khros nas smras pa | khyed kyis nga kho na'i dad pas byin pa longs spyad[24] la |[2] nga nyid sma[25] 'bebs par byed pa bas[26] ni khyed phyi sa'i 'dam du bying ste |[2] bshang gci za bar gyur kyang bla'o[27] zhes byas so ||

de nas dge slong rnams kyis bsams pa | nyon mongs pa 'di ni rmas[28] shing nyams par gyur te | 'di ltar slob pa dang mi slob pa bdun khri bdun stong la tshig rtsub po[29] smras kyis med na |[2] da yang de bas ches rmas pa dang[30] | nyams par gyur na ma legs kyis |[2] da ni bdag cag gis 'di la ci yang smra bar mi bya'o snyam nas cang mi zer bar 'dug go || de nas phyi zhig na[31] sde snod gsum pa de 'gyod pa skyes te |[32] dge slong de dag la bzod pa gsol nas | de dag gis smras pa | bdag cag gis ni bzod na |[2] khyod kyi las rnams kyis mi bzod par 'gyur ro zhes byas so ||

dge slong dag ji snyam du sems | de'i tshe yang dag par rdzogs pa'i sangs rgyas thams cad mchog gi bstan pa la rab tu byung ba'i sde snod gsum par gyur pa gang yin pa de ni srin 'di nyid yin te |

1) D cig 2) D ø | 3) D blab 4) D btang 5) D gdod *for* gang de 6) D ste *for* mo || 7) D + | 8) S bca' 'o 9) D nas *for* na | 10) D da 11) D kyi *for* kyis | 12) D + ma 13) D cad 14) D + ni 15) D dbul 16) D + pa 17) D bgyi'o 18) D + | 19) D de 20) D bgyid 21) D ma 22) D nas 23) D na *for* nas | 24) D spyod 25) D dma' 26) D pas *for* pa bas 27) D sla'o 28) D dmas *for* ni rmas 29) D pos 30) D dmas shing *for* rmas pa dang 31) D ø na 32) D des *for* |

13. *Bodhisattvabhūmi*. Wogihara 1936a: 166.24–167.3 (see too Hadano et al. 1993: 144):

ye ca vaiyāpṛtyakarā vā ārāmikā vā sāṁghikaṁ staupikaṁ vā dravyaṁ vipramādayaṁty anayena | svayaṁ ca paudgalikaṁ paribhuṁjate | tāṁ bodhisattvaḥ pratisaṁkhyāya mā haiva tat karma |

sa ca mithyāparibhogaḥ teṣāṁ bhaviṣyati dīrgharātram anarthāyāhitāyeti tasmād ādhipatyāc cyāvayati |

The Tibetan translation quoted in Hadano et al. 1993: 144 (D 4037, *sems tsam, wi* 89b7–90a) reads:

zhal ta byed pa 'am | skyed mos tshal bsrung ba gang dag gis dge 'dun nam | mchod rten gyi nor mi rigs par chud gson pa dang | gang zag bdag nyid kyis spyad par byed pa de dag la byang chub sems dpas so sor brtags nas las de dang log par longs spyad pa des de dag la yun ting por gnod pa dang | phan pa ma yin par gyur na mi rung ngo snyam nas dbang byed pa de las 'byin par byed de |

T. 1579 (XXX) 517b28–c3 (*juan* 41):

又、見衆主、或園林主、取僧伽物窣堵波物。言是己有縱情受用。菩薩見已、思擇彼惡起憐愍心。勿令因此邪受用業當受長夜、無義無利。隨力所能廢其所主。

The Sanskrit text in Dutt 1978: 114.11–14 differs slightly from Wogihara's. For *vipramādayanti*, "wastes," which conforms with the Tibetan *chud gson pa*, Dutt reads *vipratipādayanti*, "sins with regard to." According to Hadano et al. 1993: 294n6 to # 199, this is also the reading of the Kyoto University manuscript. In the Chinese version of Xuanzang, the verb with regard to which Wogihara and Dutt differ is rendered simply *qǔ* 取, "take."

14. *Avadānaśataka*. Speyer 1906–1909: II.96.6–10 (§ 86):

tatraikena bhikṣuṇā caturṇāṁ bhikṣūṇāṁ viyāvṛtyaṁ kṛtam | tair yujyamānair ghaṭamānair vyāyacchamānaiḥ sarvakleśaprahāṇād arhatvaṁ sākṣātkṛtam | pañcamena pādayor nipatya praṇidhānaṁ kṛtam | yathaibhir māmāgamyārhatvaṁ sākṣātkṛtam anena me kuśalamūlena cittotpādena deyadharmaparityāgena ca pravrajitasya upakaraṇaviśeṣair avakalyaṁ syād iti ||

D 343, *mdo sde, aṁ* 235b4–6; S 252, *mdo sde, sha* 344b6–345a2:

de'i nang nas dge slong gcig gis dge slong bzhi[1] zhal ta byas nas | de dag gis brtson pa dang | bsgrub pa dang | 'bad pas nyon mongs pa thams cad spangs nas[2] dgra bcom pa nyid mngon sum du byas so || dge slong cig shos kyis ni de dag gi rkang pa la phyag 'tshal nas smon lam btab pa | 'di ltar 'di rnams kyis bdag las brten te dgra bcom pa nyid mngon sum du byas pa'i dge ba'i rtsa ba dang | sems bskyed pa dang | sbyin par bya ba'i chos yongs su gtong ba 'dis na[2]

bdag rab tu byung ste[2] yo byad kyi khyad par dag gis[3] brel bar ma gyur cig ces byas so ||

1) S bzhi'i 2) S + | 3) S + bdag

T. 200 (IV) 247a23–29 (*juan* 9):

時彼衆中有一比丘。白衆僧言。我爲汝等。勸化檀越、供給衆僧使無有乏。汝等但當安心行道。不足爲慮。時、諸比丘聞是語已、各共用心。行道三月、皆獲道果。由是功徳在所生處。常有種種百味飲食。應念即得。乃至今者遭値於我。應念即至。供養大衆使無有乏。

15. *Avadānaśataka*, §72. Speyer 1906–1909: II.13.4–8:

sā svakena pātracīvareṇa bhagavacchāsane pravrajitā || bhagavataḥ kāśyapasya pravacane daśa varṣasahasrāṇi vaiyāpṛtyaṁ kṛtaṁ bhaktais tarpaṇair yavāgūpanair nityakair nimittikair dīpamālābhiḥ kaṭhinacīvarair dānapradānāni dattvā praṇidhānaṁ kṛtam | yan mayā bhagavate kāśyapāya kṛcchreṇa samudānīya dānapradānāni dattāny anenāhaṁ kuśalamūlena cittopādena deyadharmaparityāgena ca bhagavataḥ śākyamuneḥ pravrajyārhattvaṁ prāpnuryām iti ||

D 343, *mdo sde, aṁ* 194b1–4; S 252, *mdo sde, sha* 285a5–b2:

de rjo[1] bos byin pa'i lhung bzed dang chos gos khyer te |[2] bcom ldan 'das kyi bstan pa la rab tu byung na'[3] | des bcom ldan 'das 'od srungs kyi[4] gsung rab la lo dgu stong gi bar du zhal ta pa'i[5] las byas te | 'bras chan dang | skyo ma dang | thug pa btung ba dang | rtag res 'khor dang | mgron du bod pa dang | mar me'i 'pheng ba dang | chos gos sra brkyang rnams dang | sbyin pa dang |[2] rab tu sbyin pa rnams kyang phul te[6] smon lam btab pa | bdag gis dka' bas bsgrubs te | bcom ldan 'das 'od srungs[7] la sbyin pa dang rab tu sbyin pa dag phul ba'i dge ba'i rtsa ba dang |[2] sems bskyed pa dang |[2] sbyin par bya ba'i chos yongs su gtong ba 'dis na[6] bdag bcom ldan 'das shā kya thub pa'i gsung rab la rab tu 'byung ba thob par gyur cig ces byas so ||

1) D jo 2) D ø | 3) D nas 4) D srung gi 5) D ba'i 6) D + | 7) D srung

Chinese at T. 200 (IV) 239b9–12 (*juan* 8) is abbreviated.

16. *Divyāvadāna, Pūrṇāvadāna*. Cowell and Neil 1886: 50.15–21:

tasyāyaṁ śāsane pravrajita tripiṭakasaṁghasya ca dharmavaiyāvṛtyaṁ karoti |[1] yāvad anyatamasyārhata upadhivāraḥ prāptaḥ | sa vihāraṁ saṁmārṣṭum ārabdhaḥ | vāyunetaś cāmutaś ca saṁkāro

nīyate | sa saṁlakṣayati | tiṣṭhatu tāvad yāvad vāyur upaśamaṁ gacchatīti | vaiyāvṛtyakarenāsaṁmṛṣṭo vihāro dṛṣṭaḥ | tena tīvreṇa paryavasthānena kharavākkarma niścāritaṁ kasya dāsīputrasyopadhivāra iti |

1) Shackleton Bailey 1950: 183 suggested reading: *tripiṭakaḥ* <*saṁvṛttaḥ*> *saṁghasya ca*, on the basis of the Tibetan. The Chinese translation supports this (T. 1448 [XXIV] 16c28–29 [*juan* 4]): 而爲出家、具解三藏、爲諸苾芻番次撿校事業.

D 1, *'dul ba, kha* 7b1–3; S 1, *'dul ba, ka* 445b4–7:

de'i bstan pa la 'di rab tu byung nas sde snod gsum par gyur te | chos bzhin gyis[1] dge 'dun gyi zhal ta ba byed do || re zhig cig na dgra bcom pa zhig la dge skos bab ste | des gtsug lag khang phyag dar bya bar brtsams pa dang | rlung langs pas phyag dar phan tshun du khyer bar gyur to || des bsams pa[2] re zhig rlung zhi bar gyur gyi bar du gzhag go snyam pa las | ji tsam na gtsug lag khang de ma phyags pa zhal ta ba[3] des mthong nas[2] de kun nas dkris pa drag pos |[4] rtsub po'i dag[5] phyung ba[3] | bran mo'i bu gang[6] zhig dge skos byed |

1) S gyi 2) S + | 3) S pa 4) S ngag *for* | 5) S pa'i las *for* po'i dag 6) S ø gang

T. 1448 (XXIV) 16c27–17a4 (*juan* 4):

是時圓滿於彼教中、而爲出家、具解三藏、爲諸苾芻番次撿校事業。　後乃次至一阿羅漢、知洒掃事。彼便洒掃。既洒掃已、頻被風吹塵穢覆汚其地。時、彼阿羅漢作是念。今且待風息。然後更掃。圓滿三藏見地塵穢、以爲不掃。發嗔怒心、悪口罵辱。今此掃地、當何婢兒。

17. *Saṁghabhedavastu* of the Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya. Gnoli 1978b: 191.33–192.1:

tasya ca śāsane pravrajita āsīt vaiyāpṛtyakaraḥ | tatrānena kṣudrānukṣudreṣu śikṣāpadeṣu anādaraḥ kṛtaḥ | tasya karmaṇo vipākena tiryakṣūpapannaḥ | yat tatrānena saṅghasya upasthānaṁ kṛtam tasya karmaṇo vipākena annapānasya lābhī saṁvṛttaḥ |

D 1, *'dul ba, nga* 241b5–6; S 1, *'dul ba, nga* 330a2–3:

de'i bstan pa la 'di rab tu byung ste zhal ta byed pa na[1] de na 'di bslab pa'i gzhi phra mo phra mo rnams la gus par ma byas pas[2] las de nyid[3] kyi rnam par smin pas dud 'gror skyes par[4] gyur to || de na 'dis dge 'dun la bkur sti byas pa'i las kyi rnam par smin pa gang yin pa des bza' ba dang btung ba thob par gyur to ||

1) S + | 2) S pa de'i *for* pas 3) S ø de nyid 4) S skye bar *for* skyes par

T. 1450 (XXIV) 198c26–29 (*juan* 19):

是時、此象於彼法中出家、持戒不能堅固。復、不貴重有所虧缺。常以四事供給衆僧、成就善根。所生之處食飲充足。

18. *Mañjuśrīvikurvāṇa*. D 97, *mdo sde, kha* 252a4; S 90, *mdo sde, ta* 386a4; quoted in the *Sūtrasamuccaya*. Pāsādika 1989: 49.13–14; D 3934, *dbu ma, ki* 164b1:

’jig rten pa’i[1] dgos pa’i zhal ta byed cing mang du thos pa[2] mi tshol ba yang bdud kyi las so ||

1) *Sūtrasamuccaya* gyi *for* pa’i 2) S pa’i

T. 589 (XV) 116a25–27:

設使得爲富樂饒財豪貴大威、而貪著之。不奉博聞則爲魔業。

Chinese *Sūtrasamuccaya* at T. 1635 (XXXII) 56c17–18 (*juan* 3).

19. *Sūtrasamuccayabhāṣya Ratnālokālaṁkāra*. D 3935, *dbu ma, ki* 256a6–7:

de ltar dman pa la mos pa dag ni | dngos pos lta bas na ’jig rten pa’i dgos pa’i zhal ta byed pa zhes bya ste | yang dag par rdzogs pa’i sangs rgyas ni mang du thos pa las skyes kyi | dngos po yongs su ’dzin pa las ma skyes pa’i phyir ro ||

20. *Bodhisattvaprātimokṣacatuṣkanirhāra*. D 248, *mdo sde, za* 52b4–5; S 109, *mdo sde, na* 403a7–b1:

shā ri’i bu chos bzhi po ’di ni byang chub sems dpa’ rnams kyi bla na med pa yang dag par rdzogs pa’i byang chub bsgrub[1] pa yin te | bzhi gang zhe na | chos dang chos shes pa dang | sbyin pa dang sbyin pa shes pa dang | zhal ta byed pa’i bya ba shes pa dang | thos pa mang po btsal ba shes pa’o ||

1) S sgrub

21. *Bodhisattvaprātimokṣacatuṣkanirhāra*. D 248, *mdo sde, za* 54a7–b1; S 109, *mdo sde, na* 405b6–406a2:

shā ri’i bu ji tsam gyis na byang chub sems dpa’[1] zhal ta byed par shes par bya zhe na | des chos dang ’thun[2] pas zhal ta bya zhing de bzhin gshegs pa’i mchod rten la yang zhal ta bya’o || mkhan po dang slob dpon la yang gus pa dang bcas par bya’o || de ltar ’dis brtson ’grus brtsam par bya ste | ji ltar ji srid ’tsho’i mthar thug pa’i bar du gnyid dang rmugs pa bsal bar bya ste | shā ri’i bu ’di ni byang chub sems dpa’i zhal ta byed pa’i bya ba yin no ||

1) S dpas 2) S mthun

22. *Śikṣāsamuccaya*. MS 32b4–5; Bendall 1897–1902: 55.6–7:

> vaiyāpr̥tyavarttamānenānarthavivarjanakuśalena bhavitavyaṁ *bodhisatvaprātimokṣe* hi sahadhārmike dharmaśravaṇe tathāgatapū-jāyāñ ca vaiyāvr̥tyam u**pa**diṣṭaṁ

D 3940, *dbu ma, khi* 36a6–7; P 5336, *dbu ma, ki* 44a6–7:

> zhal ta byed pa'i tshe don ma yin pa rnam par spang ba la mkhas par bya'o || byang chub sems dpa'i so sor thar pa las | chos dang mthun pa dang chos nyan pa dang de bzhin gshegs pa mchod pa la zhal ta bya bar bstan to ||

Śikṣāsamuccaya in Chinese at T. 1636 (XXXII) 86a20–22 (*juan* 4).

23. *Bodhisattvaprātimokṣacatuṣkanirhāra*. Quoted in the *Mahāsūtrasamuccaya*. D 3961, *'dbu ma, gi* 48b6–49a1:

> *bden pa'i rnam pa'i mdo* las kyang || de la byang chub sems dpa'i zhal ta gang zhe na | de bzhin gshegs pa'i mchod rten dang | chos nyan pa dang | mkhan po dang | slob dpon rnams la snyom las med pa dang | ltos pa med pas zhal ta byed pa'i bya ba la bya'o || shā ri'i bu byang chub sems dpa' gang la las tha na legs so zhes bya ba yang re bas zhal ta de mi bya | de lta bu'i ngo bos zhal ta mi bya ste | 'di ni zhal ta shes pa zhes bya'o zhes gsungs so ||

24. *Ugradattaparipr̥ccha*. Quoted after the unpublished draft edition of Jan Nattier (20E), based on D 63, *dkon brtsegs, nga* 275a; Narthang Kanjur 51, *dkon brtsegs, ca* 30b–31a; S 11 (19), *dkon brtsegs, ca* 29b; P 760 (19), *dkon brtsegs, zhi* 318b:

> lag gi bla la brten te ji ltar dngos po yongs su gtong bar spro ba la brtson par bya'o || zhal ta byed pa la brten te bya'o cog byed pa la brtson par bya'o || dpon sna byed pa la brten te yid yongs su mi skyo bar bya'o ||

25. Bu ston's *Chos 'byung*. Lokesh Chandra 1971: 99a5–b1:

> de'i tshe nā lendra'i dge 'dun gyi zhal ta ba byas pa'i tshe mu ge chen po byung ba la gling bar nas gser 'gyur gyi rtsi blangs te gser 'gyur byas nas dge 'dun gyi gdugs tshod sbyar te dbyar gnas thon pa dang dge 'dun rnams kyis mi rid pa dang shi ba mthong nas mu ge byung 'dug pas dge 'dun gyi gdugs tshod ji ltar sbyar zhes dris pas sngar gyi tshul brjod pas dge 'dun la ma zhus par dge 'dun log 'tshol bkod 'dug pas gnas nas phyung la gtsug lag khang dang mchod rten bye ba gyis shig ces bsgo'o ||

26. *Dhammapadaṭṭhakathā* ad *Dhammapada* 74. Norman 1911: ii.77.20–78.4:

> yassa ca bālassa yaṁ kiñci vihāre uposathāgārādikaraṇavasena kataṁ navakammaṁ taṁ sabbaṁ amhākaṁ therena kataṁ ti evaṁ gihī ca pabbajitā ca ubho pi mam eva nissāya kataṁ pariniṭṭhitaṁ maññantu ti saṁkappo uppajjati

27. Mūlasarvāstivāda *Bhaiṣajyavastu*. The Sanskrit text is fragmentary, and although the editor reconstructs the missing portion, there is little utility in quoting his reconstruction. He claims to read the following (Dutt 1939–1959: i235.5–11):

> /// stukā saṁmatikā ca | tatra /// tatra ucchrīyamāṇāntikā /// yathāpi tannavakarmiko bhikṣuḥ śilāyām ucchrīyamāṇāyāṁ tat prathamataḥ śilāyāṁ nyasyamānāyāṁ sāmantakān bhikṣūn āmantrayate | avadhārayantu āyuṣmantaḥ ///

According to Wille 1990: 157, photos of this leaf have not been published; however, Yamagiwa 2001: 321n14 refers to photos in the private collection of Matsuda Kazunobu 松田和信 which allow us to correct at least the term *ucchrayaṇāntikā*. Yamagiwa does not quote the whole text, but only the key terms. For the entire passage and its parallels, see Yamagiwa's study.

The first two items in D 1, *'dul ba, ga* 24b3–5; S 1, *'dul ba, ga* 19a6–b2 read:

> de la rtsom pa'i mtha' can ni[1] 'di lta ste | dge slong lag gi blas gnas rtsom pa na[1] der thog mar gzhi 'di ni dge 'dun gi rung ba'i gnas su 'gyur ro zhes sems bskyed cing[1] tshig du[2] smras pa ste | 'di ni rung ba'i gnas rtsom pa'i mtha' can zhes bya'o || sems gtod pa'i mtha' can gang zhe na | 'di lta ste | dge slong lag gi blas der thog mar gzhi[3] rdo ba 'dren[4] pa na[1] nye 'khor gyi dge slong rnams la smras pa | tshe dang ldan pa dag gzhi 'di ni dge 'dun gyi rung ba'i gnas su 'gyur bar[5] nges par zung shig[1] nges par zung shig[6] ces bya ste | 'di ni sems gtod pa'i mtha' can zhes bya'o ||

1) S + | 2) S tu 3) S ø 4) S 'deg 5) S ba'i 6) S zhig

Although the portion which would contain the parallel passage is not available in Yijing's Vinaya translation, the discussion does occur in his *Nanhai jigui neifa zhuan* 南海寄歸內法傳 (T. 2125 [LIV] 216c24–25 [§13; *juan* 2]; Wang 1995: 109), in which the crucial expression is 初造持時、定基石已、若一苾蒭爲檢校人者. (See Takakusu 1896: 83, and Sasaki 1985: 240–241.) In Yijing's translation of the *Vinayasaṁgraha* (T. 1458 [XXIV]

545b4–5 [*juan* 4]), we also find the same passage, reading: 所謂隨一營作苾芻、或復俗人、初造房宇定甎石時. This is abbreviated in the Tibetan version (D 4105, *'dul ba, nu* 128a5). In Yijing's version of the *Ekottara-karmaśataka*, where as Yamagiwa 2001 points out, the Tibetan translation again abbreviates the passage, we find these two items as follows (T. 1453 [XXIV] 494c24–28 [*juan* 9]): 如一營作苾芻。或是俗人初造房宇。定基石時。生如是心。今於此住處當爲僧伽作淨厨。言共印持者。如撿校營作。苾芻創起基石。將欲興功。告共住諸苾芻曰。諸具壽。仁可共知。於此住處當爲僧伽作淨厨. We notice here Yijing's use of the term *jiànjiàorén* 檢校人, suggesting that the appointment is of a temporary or interim nature. The Dharmaguptaka Vinaya parallel (T. 1428 [XXII] 874c18–20 [*juan* 43]) has for the first item: 一者。檀越若經營人作僧伽藍時、分處如是言。某處爲僧作淨地, "When a donor or a manager makes a *saṁghārāma*, he distributes the places, saying 'such-and-such a place is the pure spot [to put food].' " See Hirakawa 1970: 743–744 concerning the *kappiyabhūmi* and *kappiyakuṭī*. Other parallels: Pāli Vinaya (Oldenberg 1879–1883: i.239 [Mahāvagga VI]); Mahīśāsaka Vinaya (T. 1421 [XXII] 150a [*juan* 22]); Sarvāstivāda Vinaya (T. 1435 [XXIII] 190a [*juan* 26]); Mahāsāṁghika Vinaya (T. 1425 [XXII] 477c [*juan* 31]).

28. *Vinayavibhaṅga* of the Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya. D 3, *'dul ba, cha* 280a7–b7; S 3, *'dul ba, cha* 281b4–282a5:

sangs rgyas bcom ldan 'das 'brog gnas na 'brog gi nags mchog na bzhugs so || bcom ldan 'das kyis dge slong gis shing ljon pa gcad par mi bya'o zhes bka' stsal nas | dge slong lag gi bla dag gis shing med pas mkhar lan dag btang bar gyur to || sangs rgyas bcom ldan 'das rnams ni mkhyen[1] bzhin du rmed par mdzad pas[2] sangs rgyas bcom ldan 'das kyis[2] tshe dang ldan pa kun dga' bo la rmas pa | kun dga' bo ci'i phyir dge slong lag gi bla dag gis mkhar lan dag btang bar gyur | btsun pa bcom ldan 'das kyis dge slong gis shing ljon pa gcad par mi bya'o zhes bka' stsal nas | dge slong lag gi bla dag gis zhugs shing ma mchis pas mkhar lan btang bar gyur to || kun dga' bo ngas dge slong lag gi bla'i kun du[3] spyod pa'i chos dag bca' bar bya ste | dge slong lag gi blas zhag bdun nam brgyad kyis shing ljon pa gcod par 'gyur ba na[2] shing ljon pa de'i drung du dkyil 'khor bya zhing | spos dang | me tog dang | gtor ma yang sbyin par bya | rgyud chags gsum pa yang bklag par bya | yon bshad pa yang bya zhing[2] dge ba bcu'i las kyi lam dag nye bar gzhag par[4] yang bya | mi dge ba bcu'i las kyi lam dag gi bsngags pa ma yin pa dag kyang brjod par bya |[5] 'di skad ces shing ljon pa 'di la lha gang gnas pa de gnas gzhan tshol cig | shing ljon pa 'dis mchod rten gyi 'am | chos kyi 'am | dge 'dun

gyi bya ba byed par ’gyur ro zhes kyang brjod par bya’o || de’i ’og tu nyi ma bdun nam brgyad kyis shing ljon pa de gcad par bya’o || gal te ’gyur ba ston na gcad par mi bya’o || ’on te mi ston na gcad par bya’o || dge slong lag gi blas kun du spyad pa’i chos ji ltar bcas pa yang dag par blangs te ’jug par mi byed na ’gal tshabs can du ’gyur ro ||

1) S khyen 2) S + | 3) S tu 4) S pa 5) S bya’o ||

T. 1442 (XXIII) 776a7–23 (*juan* 27):

佛在曠野林。如世尊教苾芻不應斬伐諸樹。時、諸授事苾芻緣斯事故、於諸營造咸皆廢闕。于時、世尊知而故問具壽阿難陀曰。何故授事苾芻所有營作悉皆停息。時、阿難陀白佛言。世尊、佛在室羅伐城告諸苾芻不應斬伐諸樹。由此緣故無木可求、遂廢營作。佛告阿難陀。營作苾芻所有行法。我今說之。凡授事人爲營作故將伐樹時、於七八日前在彼樹下作曼荼羅、布列香花、設諸祭食、誦三啓經。耆宿苾芻應作特欹拏呪願、說十善道讚歎善業。復應告語。若於此樹舊住天神應向餘處別求居止。此樹今爲佛法僧寶有所營作。過七八日已應斬伐之。若伐樹時有異相現者、應爲讚歎施捨功德、說慳貪過。若仍現異相者、即不應伐。若無別相者、應可伐之。若營作苾芻如我所制不依行者、得越法罪。

29. *Vinayasūtra*. Sankrityayana 1981: 38.11–17 (§2.4.11.988–990bis):

chedayen navakarmiko vṛkṣaṁ stūpasaṁghārtham | prāk tataḥ saptāṣṭeṣu divaseṣv atas tasya maṇḍalagandhapuṣpadīpadhūpabali dānatridaṇḍakaṁ bhāṣaṇadakṣiṇadeśanāṁ kṛtvā yā devatā ’smin vṛkṣe ’dhyuṣitā sā ’nyad bhavanaṁ samanveṣatv anena vṛkṣeṇa stūpasya saṁghasyetikaraṇīyaṁ bhaviṣyatīty uktā jānīhi vādena | vikāraś ced agnimokṣarudhirasyandaśākhākampanapatraśaṭanādir uddṛśyeta pakṣe ’tra dānamātsaryayoḥ saṁvarṇanavivarṇaṁ kuryāt | anuparatāvac[1] chedanam ||

1) I do not understand this word.

D 4117, *’dul ba, wu* 30a4–6:

lag gi blas mchod rten dang dge ’dun gyi don du shing ljon pa bcad par bya’o || de’i mdun rol du nyi ma bdun nam brgyad nas de’i drung du dkyil ’khor dang dri dang me tog dang bdug pa dang mar me dang gtor ma sbyin pa dang rgyun chags gsum pa gdon pa dang sbyin pa bshad pa byas nas || lha gang dag shing ljon pa ’di la gnas pa de dag gnas gzhan tshol cig | shing ljon pa ’dis mchod rten nam dge ’dun gyi bya ba byed par ’gyur ro zhes brjod nas smra ba pos shes par gyis shig ces so || gal te me ’byung ba’am khrag ’dzag

pa'am yal ga 'gul pa'am lo ma lhags pa la sogs pa rnam par 'gyur bston na || des zhing la sbyin pa dang ser sna dag gis bsngags pa dang bsngags pa ma yin pa brjod par bya'o || mi gtong na gcad par [mi][1] bya'o ||

1) So read with the commentary, D 4119, *'dul ba, zhu* 187a2.

30. *Vinayasūtravṛtty-abhidhānasvavyākhyāna*. D 4119, *'dul ba, zhu* 186b4–187a2 (I distinguish quotations from commentary with italics):

lag gi blas mchod rten dang dge 'dun gyi don du shing ljon par bcad par bya'o zhes bya ba ste | ji ltar zhe na | de'i phyir *de'i mdun rol du nyi ma bdun nam brgyad dag nas de'i drung du dkyil 'khor dang dri dang me tog dang mar me dang gtor ma sbyin pa dang rgyun chags gsum gdon pa dang sbyin pa bshad pa dag byas nas | lha gang dag shing ljon pa 'di la gnas pa de dag gnas gzhan tshol cig | shing ljon pa 'dis mchod rten nam dge 'dun gyi bya ba byed par 'gyur ro zhes brjod nas smra ba pos shes par gyis shig ces so* zhes bya ba smos te | *de'i mdun rol du* zhes bya ba ni gcod pa'i *mdun rol du sbyin pa bshad par byas nas* zhes bya ba ni thams cad de na gnas pa'i lha la brten par byas nas zhes bya ba don gyis shes par bya'o || *mchod rten nam* zhes bya ba ni mchod rten gyi don nyid la mchod rten pa zhes bya ba brjod par bya'o || *dge 'dun gyi* zhes bya ba ni dge 'dun gyi don nyid la zhes bya ba ni brjod par bya'o || *gal te me 'byung ba'am khrag 'dzag pa 'am yal ga 'gul ba'am lo ma lhags pa la sogs pa rnam par 'gyur ba ston na | des zhing la sbyin pa dang ser sna dag gi bsngags pa dad bsngags pa ma yin pa brjod par bya'o* zhes bya ba la | zhing dang lhan cig tu sbyin pa ni nges zhing la sbyin pa'o || zhing ni sangs rgyas dang dge 'dun gyi bdag nyid la bsngags pa brjod par bya'o || sbyin pa la yang ser sna'i bsngags pa ma yin pa zhes bya ba'i don to || *mi gtong na gcad par mi bya'o* zhes bya ba na de ltar byas kyang me 'byung ba la sogs pa'i rnam par 'gyur bas *mi gtong na gcad par mi bya'o* ||

31. *Vinayavibhaṅga* of the Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya. D 3, *'dul ba, nya* 3a4; S 3, *'dul ba, ja* 1254a5–6:

dge slong lag gi blas rgyu skar gi sbyor bas rung bar byed pa med na thur ma sor bzhi tsam sa la 'dzugs pa la ltung ba med do ||

T. 1442 (XXIII) 854b13–15 (*juan* 41):

若營作苾芻欲定基時、得好星候吉辰無有淨人、應自以橛釘地欲記疆界、深四指者無犯。

32. *Cīvaravastu*. Dutt 1939–1959: iii.2.145.13–146.6; re-edited on the basis of the facsimile in Raghu Vira and Lokesh Chandra 1974: folio 275a6–8 (862), with the assistance of Klaus Wille:

śrāvastyān nidānām̖ tena khalu samayena navakarmiko bhikṣuḫ kālagataḥ bhikṣavas tasya pāttracīvaraṁ kaukṛtyān na bhājayantīty etat prakaraṇaṁ bhikṣavo bhagavata ārocayanti **bha**gavān āha • sarvasaṁghaṁ sannipātyāsau lakṣitavyaḥ kiṁ saṁbhinnakārī na veti yadi saṁbhinnakārī sāṁghikaṁ stūpikaṁ karoti staupikaṁ vā sāṁghikaṁ evam adhārmikaṁ tasya pāttracīvaraṁ sacīvaracīvarikaṁ trīn bhāgān karttavyaṁ vuddhasya dharmasya saṁghasya sāṁghiko bhikṣubhir bhāja**yi**tavyaṁ vuddhasantakena vuddhapūjā vā gandhakuṭyāṁ stūpe vā navakarmaṁ karttavyaṁ dharmasantakena vuddhavacanaṁ vā lekhayitavyaṁ sihāsane vā upayoktavyam̖ na ced asaṁbhinnakārī sarvam eva bhikṣubhir bhājayitavyaṁ nātra kaukṛtyaṁ karaṇīyam̖ || ||

D 1, *'dul ba, ga* 114a6–b2; S 1, *'dul ba, ga* 151a2–7:

gleng gzhi ni mnyan yod na'o || de'i tshe dge slong lag gi bla zhig shi'o || dge slong rnams de'i lhung bzed dang chos gos la 'gyod pas[1] ma bgos pa'i skabs de bcom ldan 'das la[2] dge slong rnams kyis gsol pa dang | bcom ldan 'das kyis bka' stsal pa | dge 'dun thams cad ba sogs la ci 'dres sam ma 'dres par gyur pa de brtag par bya'o || gal te 'dres te dge 'dun gyi ni mchod rten gyir byas la | mchod rten gyi ni dge 'dun gyir gyur na | de lta bu chos dang mi mthun pa yin pas de'i lhung bzed dang[2] chos gos dang[2] gos kyi rin dang bcas pa la[3] cha gsum du byas te[4] | sangs rgyas dang[2] chos dang[2] dge 'dun no || dge 'dun gyi ni dge slong rnams kyis bgo bar bya'o || sangs rgyas kyi ni sangs rgyas la mchod pa dang | dri gtsang khang dang[2] mchod rten gyi lag gi bla'i sar spyad par bya'o ||[5] dam pa'i chos kyi ni sangs rgyas kyi gsung bri bar bya'o || seng ge'i khri brgyan par bya'o || gal te 'dres par ma gyur na thams cad dge slong rnams kho nas bgo bar bya ste | de la 'gyod par mi bya'o ||

1) S pa'i 2) S + | 3) S chas pas *for* bcas pa la 4) S bya ste *for* byas te 5) S bya | *for* bya'o ||

33. *Vinayasūtravṛtty-abhidhānasvavyākhyāna*. D 4119, *'dul ba, zu* 129b7–130a6 (I distinguish quotations from commentary with italics):

lag gi blas dkon mchog gi blangs ba nyid yin zhe na de'i phyir *ji snyed pa de snyed pa de snyed mnyam par bsab po* zhes bya ba na |

sangs rgyas la sogs pa dkon mchog rnams kyi dkor ni dkon mchog gi'o || de blangs pa ni 'dis bzung ba ste | de bas na *dkon mchog gi blangs pa nyid* de | de'i dngos po ni *de snyed mnyam par bsab par bya'o* || de'i ji snyed pa las zhes bya ba ni dkon mchog gi ji snyed pa las de dang 'drel ba blangs pa nyid ni mnyam par bsab ste | de snyed pa'i dkon mchog la cha mnyam par bya ste mnyam par bsab par bya ste | 'on kyang gal te tha dad par byed pa de dge 'dun gyi ni mchod rten gyir byed | mchod rten gyi ni dge 'dun gyir byed de de bzhin du chos kyi yang 'dres par byed na lhung bzed dang chos gos las cha gsum du byas te zhes bya ba gsungs so zhe na | 'on kyang bden mod kyi de ltar 'dis dkon mchog gi blangs par mi 'gyur ba yin te | gang gi phyir rang gi 'dod pa byas pas gzhan dang 'brel ba la gzhan dag la ster ba ni ma yin no || de ni sbyin bdag tu mi 'gyur te | mnyam par bsab pa nyid 'di shes par byed pa la de nyid 'di'i dgongs pas rnam par gnas pa yin te | gang gi phyir ma blangs pa la sbyin par rigs pa ma yin no || *yin na* zhes bya ba smos pa gang yin ba de yang drang srong gi ye shes kyis tha snyad ma yin no || rab tu grags pa can gyis kyang sdug bsngal te | de lta bur gyur pa las bsal bar shes pa'o || de bas na 'di lta bu'i dbang brtsan kho na de rnam par gnas pa yin zhes bya ba'o || gang zhig 'dir ji srid du blangs pa de srid du cha gsum bya'o || lhag ma ni dge 'dun nyid la zhes bya ba smos so || de yang de nyid kyi phyir gzung bar dka' bas zhes bya ba mthong ngo || de ni gzung bar dka' ba 'dis lhag par phul ba la skyon yon yang med de | de bas na thams cad blangs pa la bgo bsha' byed pa zhes bya'o || *lag gi blas* zhes smos pa ni 'dir mtshon pa tsam du rig par bya'o || gzhan du yang 'dis dkon mchog gsum gyi dkor blangs shing khyer ba gnyis yin no snyam du shes nas | de'i dkor la yang 'bul bar rigs pa'i phyir ro ||

34. *Vinayakārikā*. D 4123, *'dul ba, shu* 32a7:

glo bur lhags dang 'gro 'dod dang || dge skos dang ni nad pa dang ||
de yi nad g-yog nyid la yang || bza' ba sngar ni sbyin par bya ||

T. 1459 (XXIV) 637b19–20 (*juan zhong*):

若客至將行　撿挍人并病　及以看病者　隨情在前食。

35. *Rāṣṭrapālaparipṛcchā* Finot 1901: 31.1–12:

dhyānaṁ tathādhyayanaṁ tyaktvā nitya vihārakarmaṇi niyuktāḥ |
āvāsagṛdhra bhṛkuṭīkās te ca adāntaśiṣyaparivārāḥ ||

navakarmiko hy ahaṁ vihāre ātmanahetur eṣa hi kṛto me |
ye bhikṣavo mamānukūlās teṣv avakāśam asti hi vihāre ||
ye śīlavanta guṇavanto dharmadharā janārtham abhiyuktāḥ |
damasaṁyame satata yuktāḥ saṁgraha teṣu te na kurute ca ||
layanaṁ mamaitad uddiṣṭaṁ sārdhavihāriṇo 'pi ca mamedam |
saṁmodikasya ca mamedaṁ gaccha na te 'sti vāsa iha kaścit ||
śayyāsanaṁ nikhiladattaṁ bhikṣavaḥ sthāpitā iha prabhūtāḥ |
na ca lābhasaṁbhava ihāsti kiṁ paribhokṣyase 'tra vraja bhikṣo ||
śayyāsanoddiśana teṣāṁ naiva bhaviṣyate 'pi ca kadācit |
gṛhisaṁcayāś ca bhavitāras te ca prabhūtabhāṇḍaparivārāḥ ||

Ensink 1952: 91.5–28:

bsam gtan dang ni kha ton btang nas su ||
rtag tu gtsug lag khang gi las la brtson ||
gnas la brkam zhing khro gnyer 'byin par byed ||
de dag slob ma 'khor kyang ma dul ba ||
nga ni gtsug lag khang gi lag gi bla ||
bdag gi ched du 'di ni ngas byas te ||
dge slong gang dag nga yi rjes mthun pa ||
gtsug lag khang 'dir de dag gnas yod do ||
gang dag tshul khrims ldan zhing yon tan ldan ||
chos 'dzin skye bo'i don la mngon brtson la ||
dul zhing yang dag sdom la rtag brtson pa ||
de dag rnams ni sdud par mi byed do ||
'di ni nga yi gnas su bskos pa ste ||
'di ni nga yi lhan cig gnas pa'i yin ||
'di ni nga yi dga' bar byed pa'i yin ||
khyod kyi gnas ni gang yang med kyis song ||
'dir ni dge slong dag kyang mang bkod de ||
mal cha rnams kyang ma lus bgos zin la ||
'di na rnyed pa 'byung ba yod ma yin ||
'dir ni ci zhig spyad kyis dge slong song ||
de dag la ni mal stan bgo bya ba ||
nam du 'ang srid par 'gyur ba ma yin te ||
de dag khyim pa lta bur sogs 'gyur zhing ||
'tshog chas rnams dang gyog 'khor mang bar 'gyur ||

36. *Vinayasūtra* and auto-commentary. Sankrityayana 1981: 111.30–31 ([§17.1.4.79–80; and D 4117, *'dul ba, wu* 93b1); and D 4119, *'dul ba, zu* 251b6–252a2:

lokapraveśasakalpikatayoḥ bhojane | chaṇḍikavārikam |

zas rung ba dang bcas pa nyid yin na mi dag 'ong ba la sge'u chung srung ba'o zhes bya ba ni 'jig rten pa zhugs nas zas rung ba dang bcas pa nyid ces bya ba sha dang bcas pa nyid yin na | der mi gzhan dag 'ong ba dgag ba'i phyir | sge'u chung srung ba spro bar bya ste bsko bar bya'o || 'dir *sge'u chung* zhes bya ba ni dgag pa sgo ba yin par rig par bya'o || 'dir gzhung ni dge slong dag gral na zan za ba na mi dag 'ongs nas bcom ldan 'das kyis bka' stsal pa | sge'u chung srung ba bsko bar bya'o || sha dag 'drim pa na bram ze dang khyim bdag dag 'phya nas | bcom ldan 'das kyis bka' stsal pa | gang gi tshe rung ba yod pa de'i tshe sge'u chung srung ba bsko bar bya'o zhes bya ba gsungs pa yin no ||

37. *Vinayavibhaṅga* of the Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya. D 3, *'dul ba, ca* 152b1–153b1; S 3, *'dul ba, ca* 218b4–220a3:

sangs rgyas bcom ldan 'das mnyan yod na rgyal byed kyi tshal mgon med zas sbyin gyi kun dga' ra ba na bzhugs so || gang gi tshe tshe dang ldan pa maud gal[1] gyi bu chen pos nye ba 'khor la sogs pa sar pa[2] skyes phran gzhon nu bcu bdun sde'i tshogs dag rab tu phyung[3] rdzogs par bsnyen par byas pa de'i tshe na[3] bcu bdun sde dag gal te gcig la las su bsko ba bab na yang de dag thams cad bsdongs[4] te byed do || ji tsam dus gzhan zhig na gtsug lag khang der mtshan thog thag tu chos mnyan pa byung bas[5] der de dag thams cad kyis bsdongs te tron byas so || phyi de nyin par dge 'dun gyi bsro khang byung nas[3] der yang de dag thams cad kyis bsdongs te tron byas so || de'i phyi de nyin par bcu bdun sde las gcig la dge skos bab nas[3] de'i nyin mo yang thams cad kyis gtsug lag khang brgyan te 'khod do || de na dge skos tron byed pa'i tshe bcu bdun sde las gcig la blo byung ba bdag ni chad kyis nyal lo || mi bcu drug gis ci'i phyir tron mi nus snyam mo || de bzhin du re re la yang blo de lta bu byung nas[3] gzhan bcu drug po thams cad so sor nyal du dong ngo || dge skos de 'ba' zhig gcig pu |[6] mtshan thog thag las byas te |[7] mtshan mo nam nangs pa dang | mar me'i kong bu dag bsdus | sgo dag phye | gtsug lag khang chag chag btab | byug pa byas te | dus shes par byas nas stan bshams shing mchod rten gyi 'khor sar bdug spos brims te | gtsug lag khang gi steng du 'greng nas gaṇḍī brdung bar brtsams so ||

de nas bcu drug po de dag gaṇḍī'i sgras sad nas[3] rang rang gi gnas khang dag nas lhung bzed thogs te byung ba dang | de dag gis dge skos de gcig pu phar rgyug tshur rgyug cing 'dug pa mthong nas[3] de dag gis phan tshun smras pa | tshe dang ldan pa

dag 'di gcig pu phar rgyug tshur rgyug cing 'dug na[3] yu bu cag las sus kyang 'di'i grogs ma byas sam | gcig gis smras pa | kho bo la blo byung ba bdag ni chad kyis[8] nyal lo || mi bcu drug gis ci'i phyir tron mi nus snyam mo || de bzhin du gzhan yang de skad zer | gzhan dag kyang de skad zer te | thams cad kyis de skad smras so || de nas bcu drug po dag gis smras pa | tshe dang ldan pa dag 'di bdag cag gi 'phral gyi bya ba thams cad la thog mar 'gro ba yin na[3] bdag cag gis 'di'i grogs ma byas pa ni yu bu cag gis ma legs pa byas te | 'di bdag cag la gshe bar 'gyur gyis[3] zan zos ma thag tu bzod pa gsol bar bya'o zhes[3] de dag gis zan zos nas bzod pa gsol bar brtsams te | gzhon pa rnams kyis ni de'i rkang pa gnyis la gtugs | rgan pa rnams kyis ni mgul nas 'khyud de[3] tshe dang ldan pa bzod par gsol zhes byas na[9] de cang mi smra ba nyid du 'dug go ||[10]

de dang ches bshes pa gcig[11] yod pa des ga ga tshil byas pa dang | des rgod[12] par brtsams te |[7] bzod do zhes kyang zer ro || de dag gis bsams pa | de ni thabs legs pa yin no snyam nas[3] gzhan gyis kyang ga ga tshil byas shing[3] de bzhin du thams cad kyi bar gyis ga ga tshil byas pa dang | de rlung gyen du 'chugs te dus la bab bo ||

de dag brtad cing mya ngan bya bar brtsams pa dang | dge slong rnams kyis smras pa | kye bcu bdun sde dag ci'i phyir brtad cing mya ngan byed | de dag gis smras pa | bdag cag sngon ni bcu bdun sder gyur na[3] da ni bcu drug sder gyur te[3] tshangs pa mtshungs par spyod pa yid du 'ong ba dang bral zhing pham par gyur pa'i ltung ba byung ngo || dge slong de dag gis ma legs so zhes smras te dong ngo || bcu drug po de dag kyang mtha' gcig tu dong ste |[7] sems khong du[13] chud cing 'khod pa dge slong gzhan dag gis mthong nas[3] dge slong de dag gis spyo bar brtsams te | tshe dang ldan pa bcu bdun sde 'di dag ni sog ma'i me bzhin du skad cig gis 'bar zhing skad cig gis[14] shi bar gyur[15] te | yud tsam zhig rgod bag byed cing[3] yud tsam zhig[16] sems khong du[13] chud cing 'khod do zhes zer ro || de dag mya ngan gyi mes yid gdungs pas yongs su spyos kyang cang mi smra bar 'khod pa'i skabs de dge slong rnams kyis[3] bcom ldan 'das la gsol pa dang[17] | bcom ldan 'das kyis bka' stsal pa | dge slong dag dge slong de rnams la ni ltung ba med de | yang dge slong gis ga ga tshil mi bya'o || byed na 'gal tshabs can du 'gyur ro ||

1) S mo'u 'gal *for* maud gal 2) S ø sar pa 3) S + | 4) S sdongs 5) S nas | *for* bas 6) S pus *for* pu | 7) S ø | 8) S kyi 9) S nas | *for* na 10) S | 11) S zhig *for* gcig 12) S dgod 13) S khongs su *for* khong du 14) S ø 'bar zhing skad cig gis *at folio break* 15) S 'gyur 16) S + gis 17) S ø dang

T. 1442 (XXIII) 665b29–666a7 (*juan* 8):

佛在室羅伐城給孤獨園。時具壽大目連。將十七衆童子與其出家并授圓具。以鄔波離爲首。此十七人若有一人爲知事者。彼之十六盡皆相助。彼於異時有法事起通夜誦經。是十七人共來撿校。復於別日僧伽有浴室事起。彼亦詳來共相借助。復於別日中有一人合知寺事。即於是日庄嚴寺宇。時知事人專心看守。中有一人作如是念。我困且眠。彼十六人豈可不能守護。時十六人各生是念。我困且眠。其十六人並皆熟睡。唯有一知事者。通夜撿校不得眠睡。既至天明屏燈樹開寺門。掃灑房庭觀水淨不。瞻日時候敷設床座。窣堵波處燒香普熏。於寺上閣便鳴揵稚。時十六人聞揵稚聲方始眠覺。各各從房持鉢而出。見彼一人周讓弛走撿校寺事。時十六人共相謂曰。諸具壽豈無一人助斯營作。時有一人作如是語。我生是念。我困且眠。餘十六人豈可不能撿校。諸人悉皆作如是語。詳聞此已共相謂曰。此之一人於我等處。凡有所作營爲先首。我不相助彼定生瞋。我等食竟從乞歡喜。食已詳至其所俱共懺摩。其少年者即便禮足。若老大者手撫其肩。告言具壽。汝可容恕。時彼黙然而不應對。有親友者以指擊櫪。彼笑而告曰。施喜施喜。諸人各念此好方便。若一若二。乃至諸人悉共擊櫪。時彼風氣上衝即便命殞。諸人見死悲號大哭。時諸苾芻怪而問之。何謂汝今共聚啼哭。彼便報曰。大德我曹昔日有十七衆。今但十六寧不悲啼。又我得意同梵行死。有愛別離苦。復有他勝罪。云何得不悲惱。時諸苾芻聞已而去。彼十六人各在一邊懷憂而住。有餘苾芻知其同伴擊櫪致死。見而責曰。具壽汝十七衆如燒草火疾燃疾滅。或時戲樂、或復憂愁。彼爲憂火燎心。雖聞此語竟不酬對。時諸苾芻以緣白佛。佛言彼諸苾芻無殺心故無犯。然諸苾芻不應相擊櫪。若擊櫪者得越法罪。

38. *Varṣāvastu* of the Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya. Edited in Dutt 1939–1959: iv.134.7–135.5 (more than usually faulty); re-edited from the manuscript reproduced in Raghu Vira and Lokesh Chandra 1974: folio 75a7–10 (732), with the assistance of Klaus Wille:

bhikṣavaḥ sarvvān vihārān uddiśanti āgantukā bhikṣavaḥ vihanyaṁte bhagavān āha | āgantukānāṁ bhikṣūṇāṁ sārthāya anuddiṣṭaṁ vastuṁ dhārayitavyaṁ bhikṣavaḥ dvārakoṣṭhake apy uddiśaṁti | [bh](agavān) /// **m u**ddiśaṁti bhagavān āha | prāsāde noddeṣṭavya iti nirāvāseṣu prāsādeṣu kākacaṭakapārāvatāḥ vāsaṁ kurvvanti bhagavān āha || me nuvāriko bhikṣur uddeṣṭavyaḥ tena pratyavekṣitavyaḥ saced daṇḍāny asuktāni bhavaṁti | śātayi(tavy) /// **ṭāḥ** vāsaṁ kurvaṁti bhagavān āha | pratyavekṣitavyaṁ ddāṇḍāny asuktāni bhavaṁti | śātayitavyaḥ āhosvind uktāni sūtrakaṁ bandhitvyaṁ vṛddhiṁ na gamiṣyantīti | tataḥ paścāc chayanāsanaṁ dātavyaṁ | yadi tāvad alpāni vastūni bhavaṁti e[va? ka?]ṁ /// **a**parāṇi mahānti vastūni bhaṁvaṁti | vṛddhavṛddhā bhikṣavaḥ

klāmyaṁte parikarmmamāṇāḥ bhavagān āha | tāni niśṛtānāṁ dātavyāni

D 1, *'dul ba, ka* 239b4–240a2; S 1, *'dul ba, ka* 342a5–b6:

dge slong rnams kyis gnas khang thams cad bgos pa dang[1] glo bur du lhags pa'i dge slong rnams phongs[2] par gyur nas | bcom ldan 'das kyis bka' stsal pa | glo bur du lhags pa'i dge slong rnams kyi phyir ma bgos pa'i gnas gcig gzhag par bya'o || dge slong rnams kyis sgo khang yang bgos pa dang | bcom ldan 'das kyis bka' stsal pa | sgo khang bgo bar mi bya'o || khyams rnams bgos pa dang | bcom ldan 'das kyis bka' stsal pa | khyams bgo par mi bya'o || khyams stong pa rnams su khva dang | bye'u dang | phug ron dag gis[3] tshang bcas pa dang | bcom ldan 'das kyis bka' stsal pa | skrod[4] pa'i dge slong dag bsko bar bya ste | des so sor blta bar bya'o || gal te sgo nga dag ma lhags par gyur na bskrad par bya'o || de ste lhags na ni gzhag par bya'o || srin bu trai[5] bu ka dang | trai[5] la ta'i[6] tshang bcas nas | bcom ldan 'das kyis bka' stsal pa | so sor brtag par bya ste | gal te sgo nga ma lhags par gyur na bskrad par bya'o || gal te lhags par gyur na skyed[7] pas bcings na 'phel bar mi 'gyur ro || de nas gnas mal bgo[8] bar bya ste | 'di ltar re zhig dngos po nyung du zhig yin na re re sbyin par bya'o || 'on te mang po zhig yin na gnyis gnyis gsum gsum sbyin par bya'o || dngos po kha cig chen por gyur pas[1] dge slong rgan rabs rgan rabs dag byi dor byed pas dub cing ngal bar gyur nas | bcom ldan 'das kyis bka' stsal pa | de dag gnas 'cha' ba rnams la sbyin par bya'o ||

1) S + | 2) S 'phongs 3) S gi 4) S sprod 5) S tre'i 6) S tā'i 7) S skud 8) S bsgo

T. 1445 (XXIII) 1041c24–1042a7:

然、於住處所有房舍、悉皆分盡。客苾芻來、無房可與。世尊告曰。應留一房并其臥具擬客苾芻。時、諸苾芻遂留門屋下廊簷前及以踏道與客苾芻。佛言。不應留門屋下乃至踏道與客苾芻。此之處所乃是衆鳥所居、非人住處。佛言。應令一苾芻知僧伽利養、別留一房安置臥具。然彼苾芻應自守護所有諸物。復、應撿看虫及蜂窠。蜂若出窠、即應除去。兒若未出、應以線懸繫置餘處、長成自去。其有客苾芻來應給臥具。若其人少人各與一。必若人多二人共一、或三共一。有諸耆宿苾芻、既得重大氈褥。移動致難、不知云何。佛言。若耆宿苾芻不能移動、有小苾芻應令依止。

There are severe problems in understanding the text here. The Sanskrit seems corrupt in several instances, is difficult to reconcile

with the Tibetan translation in a number of cases, and the Chinese translation differs significantly from both the Sanskrit and Chinese. The whole text requires careful reexamination.

39. *Sphuṭārthā Śrīghanācārasaṁgrahaṭīkā*. Singh 1983: 79.4–17:

yāvat muner buddhasya bhagavataḥ pūjā kriyate tāvat saṁghasyāpi pūjāsatkāraḥ pravarttate ity evaṁ matvā yaḥ sāṁghikaṁ lābhaṁ stainyacittena stūpāya dadāti staupikaṁ vā lābhaṁ saṁghāya dadāti sa kṣatasaṁvaro bhavaty ayatir bhavatīty arthaḥ | nanu ca yāḥ kāścit sampadaḥ sarvās tā bhagavantam āgamyati | yonisomanasikāreṇa stainyacittāsambhavaḥ | naitad asti | etad eva hi vidāraṇaṁ stainyacittasyotthāpakaṁ yathā kāruṇyena salilam apaharata iti | kutas tasyā 'dattādanaṁ siddhyate | kiṁ punar sāṁghikāt kośāt stūpasyoddhārakaṁ gr̥hītaṁ labhyate | no m-ity āha | likhitveti vistaraḥ | sa[pta]vārikair vā pakṣavārikair vā māsavārikair vā sāṁghikāt kośāt likhitvoddhārakaṁ grahītavyaṁ | mithaḥ parasparaṁ | stūpāt saṁghasya grahītavyaṁ | saṁghāc ca stūpasyety arthaḥ | taiś ca vārikaiḥ karmādānaparisamāptau vaktavyaṁ iyat hiraṇyaṁ suvarṇādi staupikāt kośād gr̥hītaṁ sāṁghikāc ca iyad iti | noktakr̥to 'nyatheti | katham anyathā | yadi vinā likhitvoddhārakaṁ gr̥hṇanti māsaniṣkāse ca na vadanti tadā noktakr̥to bhavanti | uktaṁ na kurvantīti noktakr̥to duṣkr̥taṁ prāpnuvantīty arthaḥ ||

40. *Bhaiṣajyavastu* of the Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya. T. 1448 (XXIV) 14a26–b3 (*juan* 3):

乃至佛令差五授事、以神通力先到其舍。何者爲五。一者知其菜事。二者知其器物。三者知其食草。四者知其淨水。五者知其熟食。王見五人從空而至、問圓滿曰。此是世尊以不。圓滿報曰。此是五授事人、來此撿挍。所謂知菜等乃至熟食。世尊未至。

41. *Vinayasūtra* and auto-commentary. Sankrityayana 1981: 9.6 (§1.3.372); Bapat and Gokhale 1982: 40.29 (§1.389):

nirdoṣam anāpr̥ṣṭau gatasya karmādāne apara-tad-āgatau ||

The Tibetan text of the sūtra (D 4117, *'dul ba*, *wu*, 8b1) reads:

las su bskos par ser ba na de gzhan du byung ba na ma zhus kyang nyes pa med do ||

The commentary has:

> karmādānanimittaṁ gatasya aparasya karmādānasya āgamane doṣābhāvo 'nāpṛṣṭau ity arthaḥ | vibhaṅgād etad śayanāsanaśikṣāpadāt | niśrayaṁ gṛhṇīta iti vartate ||

D 4119, *'dul ba, zhu* 38b5–6:

> las su bskos par song ba na der gzhan byung ba na ma zhus kyang nyes pa med do zhes bya ba ni las su bskos pa'i rgyu mtshan du song ba gzhan gyis las su bskos pa la 'gro pa la skyon med de ma zhus par zhes pa'i don to || 'di ni rnam par 'byed pa las gnas mal gyi bslab pa'i gzhi las 'di dang nye ba na mthong ba ma yin te | gnas bca' bar bya'o zhes bya ba dang sbyar bar bya'o ||

42. *Vinayasūtra* and commentary. Bapat and Gokhale 1982: 27.17–25 (commenting on sūtra 156; Sankrityayana 1981: 5.17 [(§1.3.154]):

> saṁprāpte prāthamyam || tulyasamayānāṁ lābhakarmādānoddeśādi sthānaṁ yaḥ prathamaṁ saṁprāptaḥ yathāgatikayā lābho grahītavyaḥ iti vacanāt tasya lābhagrahaṇe prāthamyam || karmādāne yaḥ paścād āgataḥ tena pūrvakarma kartavyam paścād āgataḥ karmādāne prathamam iti vacanāt | prathamaṁ kāryatādi ayam arthaḥ | lābhagrahaṇe prathamaṁ sthānaṁ saṁprāpte prāthamyam karmādānakaraṇe pañcāt [*read*: paścāt] sthānaṁ saṁprāpte prāthamyam iti ||

D 4117, *'dul ba, wu* 5a5:

> sngar 'ongs pa dang po yin no ||

D 4119, *'dul ba, zhu* 26b2–4:

> sngar 'ongs pa dang po yin no zhes bya ba ni dus mnyam pa rnams kyang rnyed pa dang las su bsko ba dang ldan pa la sogs pa'i gnas gang zhig la dang po 'ongs pa de la rnyed pa blangs pa la dang po nyid de | ji ltar 'ongs pas rnyed pa blang bar bya'o zhes gsungs pa'i phyir ro || las su bsko ba la gang zhig phyis 'ongs pa des dang por bya ba nyid de | phyis 'ongs pas las su bsko ba dang po zhes bya ba zhes gsungs pa'i phyir ro || don ni 'di yin te | rnyed pa blang ba la dang por gnas yang dag par thob pa la dang po nyid de las su bsko bar byed pa la | phyis gnas yang dag par thob pa la dang po nyid ces bya ba'o ||

43. *Vinayasūtra* and commentary. Bapat and Gokhale 1982: 53.3–9 (commenting on sūtra 599–600; Sankrityayana 1981: 12.18 [(§1.3.574–575]):

kiṁ evam eva asyā dānam ity āha || pṛṣṭvā āntarāyikam | tad evaṁ asyāḥ trayaḥ āntarāyikapraśnāḥ bhavanti | eko rahonuśāsikayā bhikṣuṇyā dvitīyaḥ kevalabhikṣuṇī saṁghamadhye brahmacaryopasthānasaṁvṛtyaṁgabhūtaḥ tṛtīyaḥ ubhayasaṁghe yācitāyām upasaṁpadi upasaṁpadaṅgabhūtaḥ | yācanam atra yācite | karmādānaṁ ity ataḥ prāptam tato 'syām api yācitāyām eva dānaṁ yuktarūpaṁ ity āha || yācitāyām iti || yācitāyāṁ brahmacaryopasthānasaṁ vṛttau asyāḥ brahmacaryopasthānasaṁvṛter dānaṁ na ayācitāyām ity arthaḥ ||

D 4117, *'dul ba, wu* 11b2:

bar chad dris nas so ||

D 4119, *'dul ba, zhu* 49b5–50a2:

ci zhig 'di tsam nyid kyis 'di sbyin nam zhe na | de'i phyir bar chad dris so zhes bya ba smos te | de ltar na 'di la bar chad dri ba lan gsum du 'gyur te | gcig ni dge slong mas gsang ste ston pas bkar te dri'o || dge slong ma'i dge 'dun 'ba' zhig gi dbus su tshangs par spyod pa la nye bar gnas pa sdom pa'i yan lag tu gyur pa ni gnyis pa'o || gnyis ka'i mdun gyi dbus su bsnyan par rdzogs par gsol ba la bsnyen par rdzogs pa'i yan lag tu gyur pa ni gsum pa'o || 'dir gsol ba ni gsol bar byed pa la'o || las su bsko ba zhes bya ba 'de las thob pa de bas na gsol ba 'di la yang bsko ba rig pa'i ngo bo yin te | de'i phyir gsol ba byas nas so zhes bya ba smos te | tshangs par spyod pa la nye bar gnas pa'i sdom pa yang gsol nas sbyin par byed pa'i tshangs par spyod pa la nye bar gnas pa'i sdom pa 'di ma gsol ba la ni mi sbyin pa'o zhes bya ba'i don to ||

44. *Tanwudelübu zajiemo* 曇無悳律部雜羯磨. T. 1432 (XXII) 1047a23–24:

差作維那。敷僧臥具。分僧粥。分餅。分雨衣。處分沙彌。守僧園人。如是等諸羯磨文同。但稱事爲異耳。

Jiemo 羯磨. T. 1433 (XXII) 1059c17–18:

差作維那。使如法作。飲食。淨果。菜、楊枝。敷僧臥具。分僧粥。分餅。分雨衣。處分沙弥彌。僧園人。如是等羯磨文同。但稱事爲異也。

45. *Nanhai jigui neifa zhuan* 南海寄歸内法傳. T. 2125 (LIV) 226b19–20 (*juan* 4, chapter 31); Wang 1995: 172:

授事者、梵云羯磨那。陀那是授。羯磨是事。意道以衆雜事指授於人。舊云維那者、非也。維是周[1]語、意道綱維。那梵音、略去羯磨陀字也。

1) Later variant 唐, indicating revision after the fall of the Zhou 周 dynasty.

46. *Datang xiyu qiufa gaoseng zhuan* 大唐西域求法高僧傳. T. 2066 (LI) 5c21–27 (*juan zhong*); Wang 1988: 113:

寺内但以最老上座而爲尊主、不論其德。諸有門鑰、每宵封印、將付上座、更無別置寺主、維那。但造寺之人、名爲寺主、梵云毘訶羅莎弭。若作番直、典掌寺門、及和僧白事者、名毘訶羅波羅、譯爲護寺。若鳴揵稚及監食者、名爲羯磨陀那、譯爲授事、言維那者略也。

47. Sarvāstivāda Vinaya. T. 1435 (XXIII) 250b19–c7 (*juan* 34):

佛在舍衛國。爾時、祇陀林中僧坊中、無比丘知時限唱時、無人打揵稚、無人掃灑塗、治講堂食處、無人次第相續敷床榻、無人教淨果菜、無人看苦酒中虫。飲食時、無人行水。衆散亂語時、無人彈指。是事白佛。佛言。應立維那。立法者。一心和合僧應問。誰能爲僧作維那。是中若比丘言我能、有五法、不應立作維那。何等五。随愛、随瞋、随怖、随癡、不知淨不淨。若成就五法、應立作維那。五法者。不随愛、不随瞋、不随怖、不随癡、知淨不淨。

即時、一比丘僧中唱言。大徳僧聽、是某甲比丘能爲僧作維那。若僧時到、僧忍聽。僧立某甲比丘作維那。是名白。如是白二羯磨。僧立某甲比丘作維那竟。增忍默然故、是事如是持。

作維那比丘、應知時限、知唱時、知打揵稚、知掃灑塗、治講堂食處、知次第相續敷床榻、知教淨果菜、知看苦酒中虫、知飲食時行水、衆散亂語時彈指。

48. *Vinayavastuṭīkā* of *Kalyāṇamitra. D 4113, *'dul ba, tsu* 311b7–312a1:

zan gyi phyir 'du ba'i don tu ni gaṇḍī dang gaṇḍī chung ngu gnyis ka brdung ste | sngar gaṇḍī chu ngu brdung la khang skyong dang gtsang sbyor la sogs pas sangs rgyas mchod pa dang | lhung bzed bkru ba la sogs pa'i las byas nas de'i 'og tu gdugs tshod la bab pa'i tshe gaṇḍī chen po brdung zhing dge 'dun thams cad zan gyi phyir 'dul bar bya'o ||

49. **Nandagarbhāvakrānti* The Tibetan text is found at P 760 (14), *dkon brtsegs, wi* 249b5–250a2; S 11–14, *dkon brtsegs, ga* 390b1–7; D 57, *dkon brtsegs, ga,* 207a2–7:

kun dga' bo khyod song la dga' bo de la khang skyong byos shig par sgo[1] zhig | des kyang de bzhin du de'i thad du song nas | bcom ldan 'das kyis khang skyong byos shig par bka' stsal to || zhes bsgo ba dang | des kyang khang skyong zhes bya ba ji lta bu | des bya ba ni ci zhig byed ces dris so || des smras pa | gtsug lag khang du dge 'dun gyi bya ba dag zhal ta bya dgos so || smras pa | tshul ji lta bur[2] bya ba'i rigs | smras pa | khang skyong zhes bya ba ni gal te dge slong

rnams bsod snyoms la dong na gtsug lag khang gi nang gi sa rnams phyags nas chag chag gdab par bya'o || ba lang gi lci ba sar pa blangs nas go rims bzhin du 'jam por bsku bar bya'o || legs par yid la byas te bsrung zhing stor rlag med par bya'o || gros su bya ba yod na dge 'dun la gsol bar bya'o || dri dang me tog yod na dge 'dun la brim par bya'o || mtshan mo sgo gcod cing nam nangs na dbye bar bya'o || snam phyis dang chab khungs rtag tu bkru zhing byi dor bya dgos so || gal te gtsug lag khang zhig cing ral pa yod na bcos legs bya'o zhes de skad bstan pa thos pa dang | btsun pa kun dga' bo bcom ldan 'das kyis ji skad bka' stsal pa bzhin du thams cad bdag gis de bzhin du bgyi'o zhes khas blangs so ||

1) P bsgos, D bsgo 2) P bu, S pur

The Tibetan translation of the Vinaya version differs somewhat.

D 6, *'dul ba, tha* 120a5–b2; S 6, *'dul ba, ta* 183a2–b1:

kun dga' bo khyod song la | dga' bo la khyod khang skyong byos shig ces bsgo[1] shig | des song nas tshe dang ldan pa dga' bo bcom ldan 'das kyis khyed[2] khang skyong byos shig ces bka' stsal to zhes de la bsgo'o || des smras pa | btsun pa kun dga' bo khang skyong zhes bya ba de ci lags | de[3] ji lta bu dag bgyi | des smras pa | tshe dang ldan pa dga' bo gtsug lag khang gi las bya ste | dge slong rnams bsod snyoms la dong nas dang por je gtsug lag khang phyag dar[4] bya zhing[5] de nas ba lang gi lci ba sar pas skyong[6] nu la bya | gtsug lag khang bsrung bar bya | dge slong rnams kyis smras pa |[7] gang yin pa de brjod par bya | dri dang | me tog dang | bdug spos la sogs pa ji snyed[8] yod pa de dag kyang dge 'dun la brim par bya | nub mo sgo gcad par bya zhing[5] nang par dbye bar bya | bshang ba'i gnas dang |[7] gci ba'i gnas dag kyang spyar[9] par bya zhing | gzhan yang gtsug lag khang dang 'brel ba'i bya ba gang yin pa de dag bya'o || des smras pa | btsun pa kun dga' bo bcom ldan 'das kyis ji skad bka' stsal pa de bzhin 'tshal lo ||

1) S sgo 2) S khyod 3) S der 4) S bdar 5) S + | 6) S rkyang 7) S ø | 8) S ci *for* ji snyed 9) S sbyar

The texts in Yijing's translation of the Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya *Kṣudrakavastu* (T. 1451 [XXIV] 251b25–c5 [*juan* 11]) and the **Nandagarbhāvakrānti* (T. 310 [14] [XI] 326c23–27a3 [*juan* 56]) are identical:

汝今宜去告彼難陀令作知事人。即便往報。世尊令爾作知事人。問曰。云何名爲知事人。欲作何事。答曰。可於寺中撿挍衆事。問曰。如何應作。答言。具壽、凡知事者、若諸苾芻出乞食時應可灑掃寺中田地。取新牛糞次第淨塗。

作意防守勿令失落。有平章事當爲白僧。若有香花應行與衆。夜閉門戶至曉當開。大小行處常須洗拭。若於寺中有損壞處即應修補。聞是教已。答言。大德、如佛所言我皆當作.

50. *Pārivāsikavastu* of the Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya, with parallel in the *Kṣudrakavastu*. Edited in Dutt 1939–1959: iii.97,12–98,9; re-edited on the basis of the manuscript in Raghu Vira and Lokesh Chandra 1974: folio 310b1–5 (933), the notes in Schopen 1998: 158–161, and with the assistance of Klaus Wille:

kālyam evotthāya dvāraṁ moktavyaṁ dīpasthālaka uddharttavyaḥ vihāraḥ sektavyaḥ sammārṣṭravyaḥ sukumārī **go**mayakārṣī anupradātavyā | prasrāvoccārakuṭī dhāvayitavye mṛttikā upasthāpayitavyā patrāṇi pānīyaṁ śītalaṁ vā kālānurūpataḥ pranāḍikāmukhāni dhāvitavyāni kālaṁ jñātvā āsanaprajñaptiṁ kṛtvā dhūpakaṭacchuko dhūpaś copasthāpayitavyaḥ sa cet pratibalo bhavati śāstu**r gu**ṇasaṁkīrttanaṁ kartuṁ svayam eva karttavyam\ no ced bhāṣaṇakodhyeṣṭavyaḥ upanvāhāraṁ pratyavekṣyaṁ upanvāhṛtaṁ cec charaṇapṛṣṭham abhiruhya gaṇḍir dātavyā nidāghakāle bhikṣūṇāṁ vyajanaṁ grahetavyam tatas sarvopasaṁpannānāṁ copariṣṭāc chānteneryāpathavartinā bhikṣusaṁjñām upasthāpya bhoktavyaṁ **kṛ**tabhaktakṛtyena śayanāsanaṁ cchanne gopayitavyaṁ pātrādhiṣṭhānaṁ cchorayitavyaṁ kālaṁ jñātvā tathāgatakeśanakhastūpā saṁmārṣṭravyāḥ sukumārī gomayakārṣī anupradātavyā sāmagrīvelāyāṁ punaḥ śayanāsanaprajñaptiẖ karttavyā • dhūpakaṭacchuka upasthāpayitavyaḥ śāstur guṇasaṁkī**rtta**naṁ pūrvavat karttavyaṁ divasa ārocayitavyaḥ śṛṇotu bhadaṁtās saṁgha • adya pakṣasya daśamī tv[1] evamādi yathā upadhivārikā ārocayanti •

1) Reading uncertain; should be °īty.

D 1, *'dul ba, ga* 179a7–b6; S 1, *'dul ba, ga* 240b6–241a6:

nang par sngar langs la sgo dbye bar bya'o || mar me'i sdong bu bsal la gtsug lag khang chag chag gdab par bya | phyag bdar[1] bya | ba'i lci ba 'jam pos byug par bya'o || chab kung sa dang[2] snam[3] phyi sa phyag bdar[1] byas la sa dang lo ma'am dus dang mthun pa'i chu bsil ba gzhag par bya'o || wa kha dag bsal bar bya'o || dus shes par bya ste stan gding bar bya'o || bdug pa dang pog por gzhag par bya'o || gal te ston pa'i yon tan bsgrags par bya bar nus na bdag nyid kyis bya'o || gal te mi nus na 'chad pa po la gsol ba gdab par bya'o || kha zas kyi g-yos la brtags te g-yos zin na khang pa'i steng du 'dzegs te gaṇḍī brdung bar bya'o || sos ka tsha ba'i dus su bsil yab blangs te dge slong rnams la g-yab par bya'o || de'i 'og tu bsnyen par rdzogs pa thams cad

kyi ni tha ma |[4] bsnyen par ma rdzogs pa rnams kyi gong du spyod lam zhi bas ’dug ste | dge slong ma yin pa’i ’du shes gzhag[5] la zas bza’ bar bya’o || zas kyi bya ba byas nas |[4] gnas mal rnams skyabs yod par brtul bar bya’o || lhung bzed kyi gzhi yang dor bar[6] bya’o || dus shes par byas la de bzhin gshegs pa’i dbu skra dang |[4] sen mo’i mchod rten rnams byi dor bya’o || ba’i lci ba ’jam pos[7] byug par bya’o || dgongs ka’i dus su yang gnas mal bsham par bya’o || pog por nye bar gzhag par bya’o || ston pa’i yon tan yang dag par bsgrags pa zhes bya ba’i bar gong ma bzhin du’o || dge skos rnams ji skad brjod pa bzhin du dge ’dun btsun pa rnams gsan du gsol | deng du zla ba phyed kyi tshes bcu yang ’das lags so ||[8] zhes bya ba de lta bu la sogs pa nyi ma brjod par bya’o ||

1) D dar 2) D + | 3) S snams 4) S ø | 5) S bzhag 6) S byi dor *for* dor bar 7) S po’i 8) S ø ||

Kṣudrakavastu of the Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya. D 6, *’dul ba, tha* 103b6–104a4; S 6, *’dul ba, ta* 157a1–b2 (and see Schopen 1998: 162–163):

nang par sngar langs te sgo dbye bar bya | mar me’i snod bsal bar bya | gtsug lag khang chag chag gdab par bya | phyag bdar[1] bya | ba lang gi lci ba sar pa bzang pos byug par bya | bshang gci khang phyag bdar[1] bya | sa dang | lo ma dag dang[2] chu grang mo ’am | dron mo dus dang mthun par gzhag par bya | de nas wa’i kha phyag par bya | dus shes par bya ste | stan bsham par bya | bdug pa’i snod dang bdug pa nye bar gzhag par bya | gal te ston pa’i yon tan sgrog[3] par nus na |[4] bdag nyid kyis bya | ci ste mi nus na smra ba po la gsol bar bya’o || zas kyi skos sa la brtag par bya zhing | zas bskos zin nas khang steng du song ste |[4] gaṇḍī brdung bar bya | tsha ba’i dus su dge slong rnams la bsil yab kyis g-yab par bya | de nas bsnyen par rdzogs pa thams cad kyi ni ’og | bsnyen par ma rdzogs pa rnams kyi ni gong du spyod lam zhi bas dge slong gi ’du shes nye bar bzhag ste |[5] zas bza’ bar bya | zas kyi bya ba byas nas gnas mal phug tu brtul bar bya | lhung bzed kyi gzhi dor bar bya | dus shes par byas nas |[4] de bzhin gshegs pa’i dbu skra dang |[5] sen mo’i mchod rten dag phyag bdar[1] bya zhing | ba lang gi lci ba sar pa bzang pos byug par bya | ’du ba’i dus su gnas mal bsham par bya zhing |[4] bdug pa dang bdug pa’i snod gzhag par bya | ston pa’i yon tan bsgrags par bya | dge ’dun btsun pa rnams gsan du gsol | deng dge ’dun gyi tshes gcig lags te | gtsug lag khang gi bdag po dang | gtsug lag khang gi lha rnams kyi don du tshigs su bcad pa gsungs shig ces nyi ma brjod par bya |

1) D dar 2) S + | 3) D sgrogs 4) D ø | 5) S ø |

Kṣudrakavastu of the Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya. T. 1451 (XXIV) 245c15–27 (*juan* 10):

> 每至晨朝常須早起。開諸門戶收擧燈臺。灑掃房院。以新牛糞隨處塗拭。可於厠上亦塗令淨。咸可安置水土及葉勿令闕事。所須之水可適寒温。於水竇處洗令淨潔鳴揵稚敷座席。可備衆花燒香供養。若自能者。隨時説頌讃歎佛德。若不能者。可請餘人。若是夏月應須持扇扇諸苾芻。凡欲座時於大苾芻下在求寂上。每受食時令心安靜。食若了時爲收氈席。所有食器置於本處。掃灑食處。恒於衆中告知日數。作如是白。大德僧伽聽。今是月一日。大衆人人咸可用心。爲造寺施主及護寺天神國王大臣師僧父母十方施主。應説經中福施妙頌。

51. *Poṣadhavastu* of the Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya. Hu-von Hinüber 1994: 288–290 (§18):

> prāhāṇapratijāgrakena bhikṣuṇā prahāṇaśālā sektavyā • saṁmārjitavyā • sukumārī gomayakārṣī anupradātavyā • varcakuṭī prasāvakuṭī ca . . . [sukumārī gomayakārṣ]ī anupradātavyā • patravaibhaṅgukā sthapayitavyā | mṛttikāpānīyaṁ sthāpayitavyaṁ |

D 1, *'dul ba, ka* 135b4–6; S 1, *'dul ba, ka* 201b3–5:

> dge slong spong ba'i zhal ta byed pas[1] spong khang du chag chag gdab par bya'o || phyag dar bya'o || lci ba sar pa'i byug pas bsku bar bya'o || stan bsham par bya'o || bshang ba'i sa dang[1] gci ba'i sa byi dor bya'o ||[2] chag chag gdab par bya'o || phyag dar bya'o || lci ba sar pa'i byug pas bsku bar bya'o || lo ma'i chang bu gzhag par bya'o || bod rdog dang | sa dang | chu gzhag par bya'o ||
>
> 1) S + | 2) S | *for* ||

52. *Ekottarakarmaśataka*. D 4118, *'dul ba, wu* 196a4–6:

> dge slong spong ba'i zhal ta byed pas spong pa'i khang par chag chag gdab par bya | phyag dar bya | lci ba sar pa'i byug bas bsku bar bya | stan bsham par bya'o || bshang ba'i sa dang gci ba'i sa byi dor bya | chag chag gdab par bya | phyag dar bya | lci ba sar pa'i byug bas bsku bar bya | lo ma'i chang bu gzhag par bya | bong rdog dang sa dang chu gzhag par bya'o || bsdu ba'i phyir khang stengs nas khar gsil gsil ba 'am | gaṇḍī chung du brdung ngo || dus shes par byas nas rgyun chags gsum pa ran par gdon cing ci bder bya'o ||

53. *Mahāvagga* IX.1.1 = Oldenberg 1879–1883: i.312,4–9:

> tena kho pana samayena kāsīsu janapadesu vāsabhagāmo nāma hoti tattha kassapagotto nāma bhikkhu āvāsiko hoti tantibaddho

ussukkaṁ āpanno kinti anāgatā ca pesalā bhikkhū āgaccheyyuṁ āgatā ca pesalā bhikkhū phāsu vihareyyuṁ ayaṁ ca āvāso vuddhiṁ virūḷhiṁ vepullaṁ āpajjeyyā ti

54. *Avadānaśataka,* §50. Speyer 1906–1909: I.286.1–287.3:

sa śobhāvatīṁ rājadhānīm upaniśritya viharati | tasyāṁ ca rājadhānyām anyatamena gṛhapatinā vihāraḥ kārito yatra nānādigdeśavāsino bhikṣava āgantavyaṁ gantavyaṁ ca manyante | tasmiṁś ca vihāre pṛthagjano bhikṣur naivāsikaḥ sa cātīvāvāsamatsarī āgantukān bhikṣūn dṛṣṭvā 'bhiṣajyate kupyati vyāpadyate madguḥ pratitiṣṭhati kopaṁ saṁjanayati | ye tu tasmād vihārād bhikṣavaḥ prakrāmanti tān dṛṣṭvā prītiprāmodyabahalaḥ pratyudgamyābhāṣate ca || yāvad apareṇa samayena janapadād arhadbhikṣur āgataḥ | sa ca vihārasvāmy anāgāmī | tenāsāv īryāpathena saṁlakṣito 'rhann iti | tataḥ prasādajātena śvo bhaktena jentākasnātreṇa copanimantritaḥ sārdhaṁ bhikṣusaṅghena | sa cāvāsiko bhikṣus tatra nāsīt || yāvad dvitīye jentukāsnātre pratipādite bhakte sajjīkṛte āvāsiko bhikṣur āgataḥ | so 'pi jentukāsnātraṁ praviṣṭaḥ paśyati vihārasvāminam ekaśāṭakanivāsitam āgantukasya bhikṣoḥ parikarma kurvāṇam | tato 'sya mātsaryam utpannam | tena praduṣṭacittena kharaṁ vākkarma niścāritam | varaṁ khalu te bhikṣo 'medhyena śarīram upaliptaṁ na tv evaṁvidhasya dānapateḥ sakāśād upasthānaṁ svīkṛtam iti | tatas tenārhatā tūṣṇībhāvenādhivāsitaṁ mā haivāyaṁ tapasvī gāḍhatarasya karmaṇo bhāgī bhaviṣyatīti || yāvat sāmagrīdeśakāle saṁprāpte naivāsikena bhikṣuṇā śrutam arhato 'ntike tvayā cittaṁ pradūṣitam iti śrutvā cāsya vipratisāro jātaḥ | tato 'rhato bhikṣoḥ pādayor nipatyāha | kṣamasvārya yan mayā tvayi paruṣā vāg niścāriteti |

D 343, *mdo sde, aṁ* 137a5–b5; S 252, *mdo sde, sha* 203a4–204a1:

de rgyal po'i pho brang mdzes ldan zhes bya ba[1] na rten cing bzhugs so || de'i tshe rgyal po'i pho brang der khyim bdag cig[2] gis gtsug lag khang zhig brtsigs te | der phyogs dang yul sna tshogs na gnas pa'i dge slong dag 'ong[3] ba dang[4] 'gro ba dang gnas par sems so || gtsug lag khang de na so so'i skye bo'i dge slong zhig gnas te | de yang[5] gnas la shin tu ser sna che ba zhig ste[4] dge slong gsar du 'ong ba rnams mthong na[4] tshig pa za zhing 'khrug la gnod sems byed de | zhul zhul por 'dug cing 'khrug pa skyed par byed do || dge slong gang dag gtsug lag khang de nas gud du 'gro ba de dag mthong na ni | shas cher dga' zhing mchog tu dga'[6] skye la zhing smra bar byed do || phyis re zhig na gzhig gi yul nas dge slong dgra bcom pa zhig

'ongs so || gtsug lag khang gi bdag po de yang[5] phyir mi 'ong ba yin te | des spyod lam gyi sgo nas dgra bcom pa yin par shes so || de nas dga' ba skyes te[4] phyi de[7] nyid dge slong gi dge 'dun dang bcas par cho ga dang ldan pa'i khrus dang bshos la spyan drangs so || dge slong gzhi ba de ni de na med pa las re zhig na phyi de[7] nyin cho ga dang ldan pa'i khrus kyang phul | bshos kyang bshams pa las[8] dge slong gzhi ba[9] de yang[5] 'ongs te | de yang[5] cho ga dang ldan pa'i khrus sar song nas | gtsug lag khang gi bdag po khyed rings su byung ste | dge slong gsar du 'ongs pa'i byi dor byed cing 'dug pa mthong ngo || de nas de phrag dog skyes nas |[10] des sngang ba'i sems kyis ngag gi las rtsab po smras te | dge slong khyed[11] ni lus mi gtsang bas byugs kyang sla'i[12] sbyin bdag 'di lta bu bsnyen bkur len pa ni de lta ma yin no zhes byas so || de nas dgra bcom pa des nyon mongs pa[13] 'di las ches mi bzad pa'i skal ba can du 'gyur na mi rung ngo snyam nas[4] chang[14] mi zer bar dang du blangs so || re zhig na tshogs par gyur te dro la bab pa na[15] dge slong gzhi ba[9] des dgra bcom pa la khyod kyis sdang ba'i sems bskyed do zhes zer ba thos so || thos nas kyang de 'gyod pa skyes so || de nas dge slong dgra bcom pa de'i rkang pa la phyag 'tshal te | 'phags pa bdag gis khyod la tshig rtsub po smras pa de bzod par[9] gsol lo zhes byas so ||

1) S + de 2) S gcig 3) S 'ongs 4) S + | 5) S de'ang *for* de yang 6) S + la 7) S phyid *for* phyi de 8) S dang | *for* las 9) S pa 10) S ø | 11) S khyod 12) S bla'i | *for* sla'i 13) S ø pa 14) S cang 15) S ø na

T. 200 (IV) 227c9–228a1 (*juan* 5):

此賢劫中人壽四萬歲。波羅㮈國有佛出世、號迦羅迦孫陀。將諸比丘。遊行教化、到寶殿國。時、彼土王聞佛來至。心懷喜悅。將諸群臣、出城奉迎。到已前禮佛足。長跪請佛。唯願世尊、慈哀憐愍。受我三月四事供養。佛即然可。時、彼國王知佛許可。尋即爲佛及比丘僧、造立房舍。請一比丘用作寺主、管理僧事。每於一日餘行、不在。有一羅漢比丘入彼寺中、威儀詳序。甚可觀看寺主檀越。見其如是、請入浴室爲其洗浴。復以香油塗其身上。時、彼寺主從外來入、見此羅漢以香油塗身。心懷嫉妬、便出惡罵。汝出家人。何爲如是香油塗身。如似人糞塗汝身上。作是語已。時、彼羅漢心懷憐愍。踊身虛空、現十八變。時、彼寺主見是變已、深懷慚愧。向彼羅漢、懺悔謝過。各歸所止。以是業緣、五百世中身常臭處、不可附近。

55. *Śākyaprabha's *Āryamūlasarvāstivādiśrāmaṇerakārikāvṛttiprabhāvatī*. D 4125, *'dul ba, shu* 103b1–3:

'dir gzhung ni 'dul byed las | dge slong gnyug mar gnas pa zhig gis dge 'dun gyi zhing rmed par byed la de dang ha cang mi ring ba

zhig na khyim bdag gi zhing zhig yod pas khyim bdag de ’ongs nas smras pa | btsun pa ci bdag gi zhing rmed dam | zhing ’di ni khyod kyi ma yin gyi dge ’dun gyi yin no || des smras pa | btsun pa mi ma yin pa’i che bzhi rnams kyis bstan par bya’o || zhes smras nas | khyim bdag des sngon gyi mur phur pa btsugs pa dag des brkos te bstan pa dang | dge slong gis rmed pa bor ro || des khyim bdag de song ba dang phur ba de nang du btsugs nas zhing rmed do || khyim bdag de yang ’ongs nas smras pa | btsun pa khar rtsang bdag gis khyod pham par byas na ci da ltar yang zhing rmed dam | de ’gyod pa skyes pa dang |

56. *Śākyaprabha’s *Āryamūlasarvāstivādiśrāmaṇerakārikāvṛttiprabhāvatī*. D 4125, *’dul ba, shu* 97a4–5:

’dir gzhung ni ’dul byed las | dge slong gnyug mar gnas pa zhig gis phyogs bzhi pa’i dge ’dun gyi yo byad rnams brku ba’i sems kyis gnas nas gnas su spags nas de ’gyod pa skyes pa dang | bcom ldan ’das kyis bka’ stsal pa | pham pa’i ltung ba ni med de | nyes byas su ’gyur ro zhes ’byung ba yin no ||

This is found as a comment on *Āryamūlasarvāstivādiśrāmaṇerakārikā*, D 4124, *’dul ba, shu* 65a6–7:

phyogs bzhi ’phags pa’i tshogs kyi nor dag las || phyogs bzhi pa yi don du rku na nyams || dur khrod pa ni yongs ’dzin bcas pa nas || gos la sogs pa rku na’ang de bzhin no ||

I have not yet identified the passage in the *Vibhaṅga* to which this apparently refers.

57. *Dabiqiu sanqian weiyi* 大比丘三千威儀. T. 1470 (XXIV) 924b8–18 (*juan xia*):

直歲有十德。
一者。爲三法盡力。
二者。若有比丘從遠方來當逆安隱。
三者。當給與床席若燈火三日至七日。
四者。設房皆滿。當自避持處與之。
五者。當數往問訊占視。
六者。當爲說國土習俗。
七者。當憂所不具足。
八者。若中有共諍者。不得有所助。常當和解令安隱。
九者。若宿與不相便安。不得於衆中呵罵。亦不得呼人使共作某令主不可。

十者。不得與摩波利共諍求長短。數於衆中若行説之。亦不得取三法中所有物持行作恩惠。

58. *Samyuktāgama*. T. 99 (532) (II) 138c11–23 (*juan* 19):

如是我聞。一時佛住舍衛國。乃至尊者大目揵犍連言。我於路中見一大身衆生。其舌長廣。熾然鐵釘以釘其舌。乘虚而行。啼哭號呼。乃至佛告諸比丘。此衆生者。過去世時。於此舍衛國迦葉佛法中出家作比丘。爲摩摩帝。呵責諸比丘言。諸長老。汝等可去此處。儉薄不能相供。各隨意去。求豐樂處。饒衣食所。衣食床臥應病湯藥。可得不乏。先住比丘悉皆捨去。客僧聞之亦復不來。縁斯罪故。已地獄中受無量苦。地獄餘罪。今得此身。續受斯苦。諸比丘。如大目犍連所見。眞實不異。當受持之。佛説此經已。諸比丘聞佛所説。歡喜奉行。

59. *Dabiqiu sanqian weiyi* 大比丘三千威儀. T. 1470 (XXIV) 924a15–19:

復有六事。
一者。不得招提僧物著塔物。
二者。不得持招提僧物著比丘物。
三者。不得塔物著招提僧物。
四者。不得塔物著比丘僧物。
五者。不得持比丘僧物著塔物。
六者。不得持比丘僧物著招提僧物。

60. *Dabiqiu sanqian weiyi* 大比丘三千威儀. T. 1470 (XXIV) 922a8–17:

鉢泥僧摩波利。有十五徳。
一者。用佛故。
二者。用法故。
三者。用比丘僧故。
四者。當惜衆物。
五者。當惜招提僧物。
六者。當惜比丘僧物。
七者。當知佛事。
八者。當知招提僧事。
九者。當知比丘僧事。
十者。不得持塔物著招提僧物中。
十一者。不得持塔物著比丘僧物中。
十二者。不得持招提僧物著塔物中。
十三者。不得持招提僧物著比丘僧物中。
十四者。不得持比丘僧物著塔物中。
十五者。不得持比丘僧物著招提僧物中。

There are fifteen virtues related to the *bōnísēng móbōlì* 鉢泥僧摩波利:

1. Work for [the] Buddha.
2. Work for the Dharma.
3. Work for the community of monks.
4. Be frugal with the goods of the community.
5. Be frugal with the goods of the universal community.
6. Be frugal with the goods of individual monks.
7. Take care of the affairs of the Buddha.
8. Take care of the affairs of the universal community.
9. Take care of the affairs of individual monks.
10. Not take the goods which belong to the stūpa and apply them among the goods of the universal community.
11. Not take the goods which belong to the stūpa and apply them among the goods of the community of monks.
12. Not take the goods of the universal community and apply them among the goods of the stūpa.
13. Not take the goods of the universal community and apply them among the goods of the community of monks.
14. Not take the goods of the community of monks and apply them among the goods of the stūpa.
15. Not take the goods of the community of monks and apply them among the goods of the universal community.

61. Mahāsāṁghika Vinaya. T. 1425 (XXII) 251c22–252a1 (*juan* 3):

若比丘作摩摩帝、塔無物衆僧有物、便作是念。天人所以供養衆僧者、皆蒙佛恩。供養佛者、便爲供養衆僧。即持僧物修治塔者。此摩摩帝得波羅夷。若塔有物衆僧無物、便作是念。供養僧者、佛亦在其中。便持塔物供養衆僧。摩摩帝用者、得波羅夷。若塔無物僧有物者、得如法貸用。但分明疏記言。某時貸用、某時得當還。若僧無物塔有物者、得如法貸用亦如是。

62. Sarvāstivāda Vinaya. T. 1435 (XXIII) 249c27–250a1 (*juan* 34):

知空僧坊常住比丘應巡行僧坊。先修治塔。次作四方僧事。次知僧料理飲食事。次知應可分物。次知上座中座下座比丘事。

63. Mahāsāṁghika Vinaya. T. 1425 (XXII) 280a19–b3 (*juan* 6):

爾時有比丘。名陀驃摩羅子。衆僧拜典知九事。九事者。典次付床座。典次差請會。典次分房舍。典次分衣物。典次分花香。典次分果蓏。典次知暖水人。典次分雜餅食。典次知隨意擧堪事人。是名僧拜典知九事。

付床座時。是長老右手小指出燈明隨品次付。若、阿練若阿練若者共。乞食乞食者共。糞掃衣糞掃衣者共。一坐食一坐食者共。常坐常坐者共。露坐露坐者共。敷草坐敷草坐者共。經唄經唄者共。法師法師者共。學律學律者共。須陀洹須陀洹者共。斯陀含斯陀含者共。阿那含阿那含者共。阿羅漢阿羅漢者共。三明三明者共。六通六通者共。無威儀無威儀者共。

64. *Vinayakārikā*. D 4123, *'dul ba, shu* 27a2–5:

cig shos nyid ni nyes byas nyid ||
gtsug lag khang gtong zas dang ni ||
'o thug 'bras bu 'gyed pa dang ||
phyi de nyin par yang ni rung ||
snod spyad 'drub dang sra brkyang gi ||
chos gos dag ni sbed pa dang ||
chos gos rnams ni 'gyed pa dang ||
dbyar gyi ras chen sbed pa dang ||
khang skyong de yi mngag gzhug dang ||
de bzhin sder spyad zhal ta ba ||
rtsod pa 'gegs dang chu 'drim dang ||
bya rog la sogs skrod pa dang ||
mal stan 'dug stan stobs pa dang ||
zas 'dun 'jig rten bzlog pa dang ||
gsol dang gnyis kyi las gang yin ||
'di dag dge 'dun gyis ni bsko ||
gang phyir dang po bcu gnyis la ||
'phya dang gzhogs 'phyas gyis ltung 'gyur ||
gzhogs 'phyag brtse ba med pa'i tshig ||
'phya ba pha rol la smod pa'o ||

T. 1459 (XXIV) 633c6–18 (*juan zhong*):

嫌毀輕賤學處
苾芻作嫌言　及爲麁罵語　所得輕重罪　略言其大綱
大衆作白二　差遣分飯粥　分房行餠果　分餘雜物人
羯恥那器具　藏守支伐羅　及以分衣人　并守雨衣者
毘訶羅波羅　斯人所遣使　行器持竿水　及以驅烏人
若遣分臥具　行餠并行利　衆差如是人　嫌時皆本罪
如斯十二類　嫌罵者招本　餘使得輕愆　善可觀其事

65. *Cullavagga* VI.11.2 Oldenberg 1879–1883: ii.167,1–6:

anujānāmi bhikkhave pañcah' aṅgehi samannāgataṃ bhikkhuṃ senāsanagāhāpakaṃ sammannituṃ yo na chandāgatiṃ

gaccheyya na dosāgatiṃ gaccheyya na mohāgatiṃ gaccheyya na bhayāgatiṃ gaccheyya gahitāgahitañ ca jāneyya | evañ ca pana bhikkhave sammannitabbo |

66. *Adhikaraṇavastu* of the Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya. Gnoli 1978a: 84.21–85.3:

tataḥ saṁghenādhikaraṇasaṁcārako bhikṣuḥ saṁmantavyaḥ pañcabhir dharmaiḥ samanvāgataḥ adhikaraṇasaṁcārako bhikṣur asaṁmato na saṁmantavyaḥ saṁmataś cāvakāśayitavyaḥ | katamaiḥ paṁcabhiḥ | chandād gacchati dveṣān mohād bhayād gacchati saṁcāritāsaṁcāritaṁ cādhikaraṇaṁ na jānāti | ebhiḥ pañcabhir dharmaiḥ samanvāgataḥ adhikaraṇasaṁcārako bhikṣur asaṁmato na saṁmantavyaḥ saṁmataś cāvakāśayitavyaḥ | pañcabhis tu dharmaiḥ samanvāgataḥ adhikaraṇasaṁcārako bhikṣur asaṁmataś ca saṁmantavyas saṁmataś ca nāvakāśayitavyaḥ | katamaiḥ pañcabhiḥ | na chandād gacchati na dveṣān na mohān na bhayād gacchati saṁcāritāsaṁcāritaṁ cādhikaraṇaṁ jānāti | ebhiḥ pañcabhir dharmaiḥ samanvāgataḥ adhikaraṇasaṁcārako bhikṣur asaṁmataś ca saṁmantavyas saṁmataś ca nāvakāśayitavyaḥ |

D 1, *'dul ba, ga* 239a1–4; S 1, *'dul ba, ga* 324a6–b4:

de nas dge 'dun gyis dge slong rtsod pa de sbed pa bsko bar bya'o || chos lnga dang ldan pa'i dge slong rtsod pa sbed pa ma bskos pa ni bsko bar mi bya'o || bskos pa ni dbyung bar bya'o || lnga gang zhe na | 'dun pas 'gro ba dang | zhe sdang gis 'gro ba dang | gti mug gis 'gro ba dang | 'jigs pas 'gro ba dang | rtsod pa sbos pa dang ma sbos pa mi shes pa ste | chos 'di lnga dang ldan pa'i dge slong rtsod pa sbed pa ma bskos pa ni bsko bar mi bya'o || bskos pa ni dbyung bar bya'o || chos lnga dang ldan pa'i dge slong rtsod pa sbed pa ma bskos pa ni bsko bar bya'o || bskos pa ni dbyung bar mi bya'o || lnga gang zhe na | 'dun pas mi 'gro ba dang | zhe sdang gis mi 'gro ba dang | gti mug gis mi 'gro ba dang | 'jigs pas mi 'gro ba dang | rtsod pa sbos pa dang ma sbos pa shes pa ste | chos 'di lnga dang ldan pa'i dge slong rtsod pa sbed pa ma bskos pa ni bsko bar bya'o ||

67. *Adhikaraṇavastu* of the Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya. Gnoli 1978a: 89.17–28:

tataḥ śalākācārako bhikṣuḥ saṁmantavyaḥ | pañcabhir dharmaiḥ samanvāgataḥ śalākācārako bhikṣur asaṁmatona saṁmantavyaḥ saṁmataś cāvakāśayitavyaḥ | katamaiḥ paṁcabhiḥ | chandād gacchati dveṣān mohād bhayād gacchati cāritācāritaṁ ca śalākāṁ na jānāti | ebhiḥ pañcabhir dharmaiḥ

samanvāgataḥ śalākācārako bhikṣur asaṁmato na saṁmantavyaḥ saṁmataś cāvakāśayitavyaḥ | pañcabhis tu dharmaiḥ samanvāgataḥ śalākācārako bhikṣur asaṁmataḥ saṁmantavyas saṁmataś ca nāvakāśayitavyaḥ | katamaiḥ pañcabhiḥ | na chandād gacchati na dveṣān mohād bhayād gacchati cāritācāritaṁ ca śalākāṁ jānāti | ebhiḥ pañcabhir dharmaiḥ samanvāgataḥ śalākācārako bhikṣur asaṁmataś ca saṁmantavyaḥ saṁmataś ca nāvakāśayitavyaḥ |

D 1, *'dul ba, ga* 242a3–7; S 1, *'dul ba, ga* 329a5–b3:

des na tshul shing 'brim[1] pa'i dge slong bsko bar bya ste | chos lnga dang ldan pa'i dge slong tshul shing 'brim[1] par ma bskos pa ni bsko bar mi bya'o || bskos pa ni dbyung bar bya'o || lnga gang zhe na | 'dun pas 'gro ba dang | zhe sdang gis 'gro ba dang | gti mug gis 'gro ba dang | 'jigs pas 'gro ba dang | tshul shing brims pa dang ma brims pa mi shes pa ste | chos 'di lnga dang ldan pa'i dge slong tshul shing 'brim[1] par ma bskos pa ni bsko bar mi bya'o || bskos pa ni dbyung bar bya'o || chos lnga dang ldan pa'i dge slong tshul shing 'brim[1] par ma bskos pa ni bsko bar bya'o || bskos pa ni dbyung bar mi bya'o || lnga gang zhe na | 'dun bas mi 'gro ba dang | zhe sdang gis mi 'gro ba dang | gti mug gis mi 'gro ba dang | 'jigs pas mi 'gro ba dang | tshul shing brims pa dang ma brims pa shes pa ste | chos 'di lnga dang ldan pa'i dge slong tshul shing 'brim par ma bskos pa ni bsko bar bya'o || bskos pa ni dbyung[2] bar mi bya'o ||

1) S 'drim 2) S 'byung

68. *Poṣadhavastu* of the Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya. I quote the manuscript as read by Hu-von Hinüber 1994: 282–284 (§15–16.2) (cf. Matsumura 1996: 196n100), including obvious restorations:

bhagavān āha || prahāṇapratijāgrako bhikṣus saṁmantavyaḥ | pañcabhir dharmaiḥ samanvāgataḥ prahāṇapratijāgrako bhikṣuḥ asaṁmato na saṁmantavyaḥ saṁmataś cāvakāśayitavyaḥ | katamaiḥ paṁcabhiḥ chandād gacchati dveṣān mohād bhayād gacchati | jāgṛtājāgṛtāṁ prahāṇaṁ na jānāti | ebhiḥ pañcabhir dharmais samanvāgataḥ prahāṇapratijāgrako bhikṣur asaṁmato na saṁmantavyaḥ | saṁmataś cāvakāśayitavyaḥ | pañcabhir dharmais samanvāgataḥ prahāṇapratijāgrako bhikṣuḥ asaṁmato saṁmantavyas saṁ mataś ca nāvakāśayitavyaḥ | katamaiḥ pañcabhiḥ na cchandād gacchati na dveṣān na mohān na bhayād gacchati pratijāgṛtāpratijāgṛtāñ ca prahāṇaṁ jānāti | ebhiḥ paṁcabhir dharmaiḥ samanvā-

gataḥ prahāṇapratijāgrako bhikṣuḥ asaṁmato saṁmantavyas saṁmataś ca nāvakāśayitavyaḥ |

D 1, *'dul ba, ka* 135a1–5; S 1, *'dul ba, ka* 200b2–201a1 (with P 1030, *'dul ba, khe* 132a4–8, quoted by Matsumura 1996: 196n100):

de dag de nas song zhing yang phyis 'ongs nas[1] bcom ldan 'das kyis bka' stsal pa | dge slong spong ba'i zhal ta byed pa bsko[2] bar bya'o ||[3] dge slong spong ba'i zhal ta byed pa chos lnga dang ldan pa ni ma bskos pa yang bsko bar mi bya la | bskos pa yang dbyung bar bya ste | lnga gang zhe na | 'dun pas 'gro ba dang | zhe sdang gis 'gro ba dang | gti mug gis 'gro ba dang | 'jigs pas 'gro ba dang | spong ba la tron[4] byas pa dang ma byas pa mi shes pa ste | dge slong spong ba'i zhal ta byed pa[1] chos lnga po de dag dang ldan pa ni ma bskos pa yang bsko bar mi bya la | bskos pa yang dbyung bar bya'o || dge slong spong ba'i zhal ta byed pa chos lnga dang ldan pa ni[1] ma bskos pa yang bsko bar bya la | bskos pa yang dbyung bar mi bya ste | lnga gang zhe na | 'dun pas mi 'gro ba dang | zhe sdang gis mi 'gro ba dang | gti mug gis mi 'gro ba dang | 'jigs pas mi 'gro ba dang | spong ba la tron byas pa dang ma byas pa shes pa ste | dge slong spong ba'i zhal ta byed pa[1] chos lnga po de dag dang ldan pa ni[1] ma bskos pa yang bsko bar bya la | bskos pa yang dbyung bar mi bya'o ||

1) S + | 2) S bskor 3) S bya ste | *for* bya'o || 4) P dron

69. *Pravāraṇāvastu* of the Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya. Chung 1998: 180–181 (§2.3.2.1) (see D 1, *'dul ba, ka* 223a5–b2):

de nas dgag dbye byed pa'i dge slong gcig gam | gnyis sam | mang po bsko bar bya ste | chos lnga dang ldan pa'i dge slong dgag dbye byed par ma bskos pa ni bsko bar mi bya'o || bskos pa ni dbyung bar bya'o || lnga gang zhe na | 'dun pas 'gro ba dang | zhe sdang gis 'gro ba dang | gti mug gis 'gro ba dang | 'jigs pas 'gro ba dang | dgag dbye dang dgag dbye ma yin pa mi shes pa ste | chos 'di lnga dang ldan pa'i dge slong dgag dbye byed par ma bskos pa ni bsko bar mi bya'o || bskos pa ni dbyung bar bya'o || chos lnga dang ldan pa'i dge slong ni dgag dbye byed par ma bskos pa ni bsko bar bya'o || bskos pa ni dbyung bar mi bya'o || lnga gang zhe na | 'dun pas mi 'gro ba dang | zhe sdang gis mi 'gro ba dang | gti mug gis mi 'gro ba dang | 'jigs pas mi 'gro ba dang | dgag dbye dang dgag dbye ma yin pa shes pa ste | chos 'di lnga dang ldan pa'i dge slong ni dgag dbye byed par ma bskos pa ni bsko bar bya'o || bskos pa ni dbyung bar mi bya'o ||

70. *Varṣāvastu* of the Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya. D 1, *'dul ba, ka* 238a3–6; S 1, *'dul ba, ka* 339b7–340a5:

gnas mal stobs pa'i dge slong bsko bar bya ste | chos lnga dang ldan pa'i dge slong gnas mal stobs par ma bskos pa ni bsko bar mi bya'o || bskos pa ni dbyung bar bya'o || lnga gang zhe na | 'dun pas 'gro ba dang | zhe sdang gis 'gro ba dang | gti mug gis 'gro ba dang | 'jigs pas 'gro ba dang | gnas mal bstabs pa dang[1] ma bstabs pa mi shes pa ste | chos 'di lnga dang ldan pa'i dge slong gnas mal stobs par ma bskos pa ni bsko bar mi bya'o || bskos pa ni dbyung bar bya'o || chos lnga dang ldan pa'i dge slong gnas mal stobs par ma bskos pa ni bsko bar bya'o || bskos pa ni dbyung bar mi bya'o || lnga gang zhe na | 'dun pas mi 'gro ba dang | zhes sdang gis mi 'gro ba dang | gti mug gis mi 'gro ba dang | 'jigs pas mi 'gro ba dang | gnas mal bstabs pa dang[1] ma bstabs pa shes pa ste |

1) S + |

T. 1445 (XXIII) 1041b13–15:

應差一苾芻爲掌臥具人。若有五法者、即不應差。云何爲五。謂有愛 • 恚 • 怖 • 癡 • 不知臥具分與不分。翻前五法、是即應差。應如是差。

71. *Vinayavibhaṅga* of the Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya. D 3, *'dul ba, cha* 194b5–195a3; S 3, *'dul ba, cha* 168b2–169a1:

de nas ral gri'i mthu can gyi khrom de dag phyir mkhos su phab nas[1] dge slong rnams kyis dgag dbye byas pa'i tshe[1] dge slong de dag de dag[2] gi gan du dong ste smras pa | bzhin bzangs dag kho bo cag dgag dbye byas kyis chos gos dag byin cig | 'phags pa dag bdag cag gis chos gos dag phul lags kyis[1] de dag bzhes shig | dge slong de dag dong ste gnas khang sgo phye[3] ba dang | phyogs des snum zhing mngar[4] bas chos gos de dag sril[5] dag gis rmugs[6] te[1] rdul du brlags[7] te 'dug par snang ba'i skabs de dge slong rnams kyis[1] bcom ldan 'das la gsol pa dang | bcom ldan 'das kyis bka' stsal pa | dge slong dag gos sbed pa'i dge slong bsko bar bya ste[8] | gos sbed pa'i dge slong chos lnga dang ldan pa ni[9] ma bskos pa ni bsko bar mi bya la | bskos pa yang dbyung bar bya ste | lnga gang zhe na | 'dun pas[10] 'gro ba dang | zhe sdang gis 'gro ba dang | gti mug gis 'gro ba dang | 'jigs pas 'gro ba dang | gos kyi rnyed pa sbas pa dang ma sbas pa mi shes pa'o || gos sbed pa'i dge slong chos lnga dang ldan pa ni ma bskos pa yang bsko bar bya la | bskos pa yang dbyung bar mi bya ste | lnga gang zhe na | 'dun pas mi 'gro ba dang | zhe sdang gis mi 'gro ba dang | gti mug gis mi 'gro ba dang | 'jigs pas mi 'gro ba dang | gos sbas pa dang ma sbas[11] pa shes pa'o ||

1) S + | 2) S ø de dag 3) S che 4) S dngar 5) S srin 6) S gi mugs *for* gis rmugs 7) S rlags 8) S te 9) S yang *for* ni 10) S pa 11) S sbad

T. 1442 (XXIII) 754b27–c6 (*juan* 23):

時、諸苾芻夏安居了。往諸人所報曰。賢首、我随意事訖有衣與我。彼便報曰。聖者、我先與之彼處應取。時、諸苾芻開房取物。但見螻蟻土封積成大聚。時、諸苾芻以縁白佛。佛言、應差藏衣苾芻。若苾芻五法不具者、此不應差。差不應作。云何爲五。謂有愛•恚•怖•癡•藏與未藏不能曉了。五法具者、此即應差。差應令作。云何爲五。謂無愛•恚•怖•癡•藏與未藏善能曉了。

72. *Kaṭhinavastu* of the Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya. Matsumura 1996: 196–197 (§7) (earlier edited in Chang 1957: 53–54 [§7]):

tataḥ paścāt kaṭhināstārako bhikṣuḥ saṁmantavyaḥ paṁcabhir dharmais samanvāgataḥ kaṭhināstārako bhikṣur asaṁmato na saṁmantavyaḥ saṁmataś cāvakāśayitavyaḥ katamaiḥ paṁcabhiḥ avarṣiko vaṣācchinnakaḥ paścimakāṁ varṣāṁ varṣām upagato anyattra varṣoṣitaḥ śikṣādattakaḥ apare api paṁca saṁmantavyāḥ pārivāsika mūlapārivāsika mānāpya mūlamānāpyacāra utkṣiptakaḥ apare paṁca na saṁmantavyā cchandād gacchati dveṣāṁ mohāt bhayād gacchati āstṛtaṁ cānāstṛtaṁ kaṭhinaṁ na jānāti: paṁcabhis tu dharmai samanvāgataḥ kaṭhināstārako bhikṣur asaṁmataś ca saṁmantavyaḥ saṁmataś ca nāvakāśayitavyaḥ katamaiḥ paṁcabhiḥ na cchandād gacchati na dveṣān na mohān na bhayād gacchati āstṛtānāstṛtaṁ ca kaṭhinaṁ jānāti

Tibetan edited in Chang 1957: 81 (see D 1, *'dul ba, ga* 117a6–b3):

de'i 'og tu sra brkyang 'dings pa'i dge slong bsko bar bya ste | chos lnga dang ldan pa'i dge slong ni sra brkyang 'dings par ma bskos pa ni bsko bar mi bya zhing bskos ba ni dbyung bar bya'o || lnga gang zhe na | dbyar gyi ma yin pa dang | dbyar ral ba dang | dbyar phyi mar gnas par dam bcas pa dang | dbyar tha dad par gnas pa dang | bslab pa byin pa'o || gzhan yang chos lnga dang ldan na bsko bar mi bya ste | spo ba pa dang | gzhi nas spob pa dang | mgu bar bya ba spyod pa dang | gzhi nas mgu bar bya ba spyod pa dang | gnas nas phyung ba'o || gzhan yang chos lnga dang ldan na bsko bar mi bya ste | 'dun pas 'gro ba dang | zhe sdang gis 'gro ba dang | gti mug gis 'gro ba dang | 'jigs pas 'gro ba dang | sra brkyang bting ba dang ma bting ba mi shes pa'o || yang chos lnga dang ldan pa'i dge slong ni sra brkyang 'dings par ma bskos pa ni bsko bar bya zhing bskos pa ni dbyung bar mi bya'o || lnga gang zhe na | 'dun pas mi 'gro ba dang | zhes dang gis mi

’gro ba dang | gti mug gis mi ’gro ba dang | ’jigs pas mi ’gro ba dang | sra brkyang bting ba dang ma bting ba shes pa’o ||

T. 1449 (XXIV) 97c16–18:

次當差張羯恥那衣苾芻。須具五徳者、應可量差。所謂無欲•愛•恚•癡•知張與不張。若異此者、即不應差。如是應差、爲前方便。

73. *Śayanāsanavastu* of the Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya. Gnoli 1978a: 54.22–55.6:

bhagavān āha | vihāroddeśako bhikṣuḥ saṁmantavyaḥ | bhikṣavo ’viśeṣeṇa saṁmanyante | bhagavāna āha | pañcabhir dharmaiḥ samanvāgataḥ vihāroddeśako bhikṣur asaṁmato na saṁmantavyaḥ saṁmataś cāvakāśayitavyaḥ | katamaiḥ pañcabhiḥ | chandād gacchati dveṣān mohād bhayād gacchati uddiṣṭānuddiṣṭavihāraṁ na jānāti | ebhiḥ pañcabhir dharmaiḥ samanvāgataḥ vihāroddeśako ’saṁmato na saṁmantavyaḥ saṁmataś cāvakāśayitavyaḥ | pañcabhis tu dharmaiḥ samanvāgato vihāroddeśakaḥ asaṁmataḥ saṁmantavyas saṁmataś ca nāvakāśayitavyaḥ | katamaiḥ pañcabhiḥ | na chandād gacchati na dveṣān na bhayān na mohād gacchati uddiṣṭānuddiṣṭaṁ ca jānāti | ebhiḥ pañcabhir dharmaiḥ samanvāgato vihāroddeśakaḥ asaṁmataś ca saṁmantavyaḥ saṁmatav ca nāvakāśayitavyaḥ |

D 1, *’dul ba, ga* 221a5–b2; S 1, *’dul ba, ga* 299b6–300a4:

bcom ldan ’das kyis bka’ stsal pa | gnas khang sko ba’i dge slong bsko bar bya’o || dge slong rnams kyis[1] phal pa las bskos nas | bcom ldan ’das kyis bka’ stsal pa | chos lnga dang ldan pa’i dge slong gtsug lag khang ’ged[2] par ma bskos pa ni bsko bar mi bya’o || bskos pa ni dbyung bar bya’o || lnga gang zhe na | ’dun bas ’gro ba dang | zhe sdang gis ’gro ba dang | gti mug gis ’gro ba dang | ’jigs bas ’gro ba dang | gtsug lag khang bskos pa dang[3] ma bskos pa mi shes[4] pa ste | chos ’di lnga dang ldan pa ni gtsug lag khang sko bar ma bskos pa ni bsko bar mi bya’o || bskos pa ni dbyung bar bya’o || yang chos lnga dang ldan pa ni gtsug lag khang sko bar ma bskos pa ni bsko bar bya’o || bskos pa ni dbyung bar mi bya’o || lnga gang zhe na | ’dun pas mi ’gro ba dang | zhe sdang gis mi ’gro ba dang | gti mug gis mi ’gro ba dang | ’jigs pas mi ’gro ba dang | gtsug lag khang bskos pa dang ma bskos ba shes pa ste | chos ’di lnga dang ldan pa ni gtsug lag khang sko[5] bar ma bskos ba ni bsko bar bya’o || bskos pa ni dbyung bar mi bya’o ||

1) S kyi 2) S ’gyed 3) S + | 4) S shis 5) S bsko

74. *Dafangbian fobaoen jing* 大方便佛報恩經. T. 156 (III) 141a27–b20 (*juan* 3):

爾時、世尊與阿難入王舍城。乞食已還出城。於城門外有大深坑。時、王舍城人擔持大小便利、棄是坑中。天雨惡水亦入其中。爾時、此洸水中有一虫。其形似人、衆多手足。遥見如來擎頭出水、視於如來流淚滿目。如來見已、愍而哀傷慘然不悦。即還耆闍崛山。爾時、阿難敷尼師檀。如來坐上結加趺坐。爾時、阿難觀察衆心問如來言。世尊、向所見洸度中虫者。先世造何業行。生此水中爲幾時耶。復於何時當得解脱。佛告阿難及諸大衆。汝等善聽。當爲汝説。阿難、乃往過去無量千劫。爾時、有佛出興于世、教化已周。遷神涅槃滅度之後、於像法中、有一婆羅門。造立僧房、供養衆僧。時、有檀越多送酥油。時、有客比丘來。爾時、知事維那心生瞋恚。嫌客僧來多。隱匿酥油、停持不與。客衆僧言。何不付酥油蜜耶。維耶答言。汝客我舊。客比丘言。此是檀越施現前僧。爾時、維那兇惡可畏、即便罵詈。汝何不燠屎尿也。云何從我乃索酥油。以此惡言、從是已來九十億劫常生於是洸水之中。爾時維那者、今此洸水中虫。是由過去世發一惡言訶罵衆僧、無量千世住此屎中。

D 353, *mdo sde, aḥ*, 130a3–b7; S 180, *mdo sde, wa*, 307b6–308b6:

de'i tshe bcom ldan 'das dang kun dga' bo rgyal po'i khab tu bsod snyoms blangs nas slar gshegs pa dang | grong khyer gyi phyi rol na grog po zab mo cig[1] yod do ||[2] rgyal po'i khab kyi grong khyer gyi mi rnams bshang gci dang |[3] mi gtsang ba thams cad grog po der skyel lo || char pa bab na gru char gyi chu rnams kyang der 'bab po || de'i tshe grog po'i chu btsog pa de'i nang na srin bu mi'i gzugs 'dra ba la rkang lag mang ba zhig gis rgyang ma nas de bzhin gshegs pa byon pa mthong nas chu'i nang nas mgo bteg nas de bzhin gshegs pa la bltas nas mig nas mchi ma zag go || bcom ldan 'das kyis de gzigs nas thugs rje bar dgongs te mi dgyes par gyur nas[4] slar bya rgod spungs pa'i ril gshegs so || de nas kun dga' bos de bzhin gshegs pa'i gdan gding ba bting nas[4] skyil mo krung bcas nas bzhugs so || de nas kun dga' bos 'khor thams cad la bltas te[4] 'khor gyi[5] bsam pa sems kyis shes nas bcom ldan 'das la 'di skad ces gsol to || bcom ldan 'das da ci chab btshog pa'i nang na srin bu zhig mchis ba de[4] sngon las ci bgyis pas chab btshog pa de'i nang du skyes | der skyes nas ni ji srid cig lags | da[6] yang nam zhig de las thar par 'gyur | bcom ldan 'das kyis kun dga' bo dang 'khor mang po la 'di skad ces bka' stsal to || khyod[7] legs par nyon cig | khyod[7] la legs par dgrol[8] bar bshad par bya'o || kun dga' bo ston[9] 'das pa'i dus na bskal pa grangs med pa stong 'das pa'i sngon rol na | de'i tshe de'i dus na sangs rgyas 'jig rten du gshegs nas[4] sems can gyi don

mdzad de[10] yongs su mya ngan las 'das so || mya ngan las 'das nas gzugs brnyan la chos spyod pa na[4] bram ze zhig gis dge 'dun gyi gnas khang byas te[4] dge 'dun la phul lo || de'i tshe na yon bdag zhig[11] gis dge 'dun la mar dang |[3] 'bru mar dang phul te[4] de na dge slong 'dron[12] po dag cig[13] kyang lhags so[14] || de'i tshe gang zag gi las gtsang sbyor byed pa zhig |[3] dge slong 'dron[15] po 'ongs pa mthong nas[4] 'khren te mar dang |[3] 'bru mar bcabs shing bsres nas dge 'dun 'dron[15] po la ma byin no || dge 'dun 'dron pos[16] gtsang sbyor la mar dang | 'bru mar dang | sbrang rtsi 'ongs pa nged la mi sbyin nam zhes dris[17] pa dang | gtsang sbyor gyis khyed ni 'dron[15] po | nged ni gza'[18] yin no zhes smras so || dge slong 'dron[15] pos yon bdag gis[19] mngon sum gyi dge 'dun la phul ba ma yin nam[20] zhes smras pa dang | de'i tshe na gtsang sbyor gyi las byed pa de khros shing 'jigs su rung ba zhig pas | dge slong 'dron[15] po la khyed bsang gci mi za bar nga la mar dang |[3] 'bru mar 'dod dam zhes tshig ngan pa smras so || de ltar tshig ngan pa smras pa'i las kyis bskal ba bye ba dgu bcu'i bar du rgyun du chu btsog pa 'dir skyes par gyur to ||[21] de'i tshe de'i dus na gtsang sbyor gyi las byed pa de[22] ni da ci chu btsog pa'i nang na 'dug pa'i srin bu de yin no || de ltar 'das pa'i dus na tshig ngan pa gcig dge 'dun la smras pas |[3] tshe rabs bgrangs[23] pa brgya stong gi bar du gnas[24] der skyes so ||

1) S gcig 2) S yod | 3) S | ø 4) S | 5) S ø gyi 6) S de 7) S khyed 8) S grol 9) S sngon 10) S do || 11) S cig 12) S mdron 13) S gcig 14) S se 15) S mgron 16) S dge 'dun pas *for* dge 'dun 'dron pos 17) S ø dris 18) S bza' 19) S gi 20) S ø nam 21) S te | 22) S pa de ø 23) S grangs + med 24) S + btsogs pa

75. *Karmaśataka*, §10, *sna ma'i me thog*. D 340, *mdo sde, ha* 40b2–41a6; S 274, *mdo sde, ha* 59a6–60b1:

dge slong dag sngon byung ba 'das pa'i dus na | bskal pa bzang po 'di nyid la skye dgu'i tshe lo nyi khri thub pa na |[1] yang dag par rdzogs pa'i sangs rgyas rig pa dang zhabs su ldan pa |[2] bde bar gshegs pa | 'jig rten mkhyen pa | skyes bu gdul bya'i[3] kha lo sgyur ba | bla na med pa |[2] lha dang mi rnams kyi ston pa |[1] sangs rgyas bcom ldan 'das 'od srung[4] zhes bya ba 'jig rten du byung ste | de'i tshe wā rā ṇā si[5] na khyim bdag phyug cing nor mang la longs spyod che ba |[2] yongs su 'dzin pa |[1] yangs shing rgya che ba |[2] rnam thos kyi bu'i nor dang ldan pa | rnam thos kyi bu'i nor dang 'gran pa zhig gnas pa des |[2] thabs zlar bab pa las[6] chung ma blangs nas | de de dang lhan cig tu rtse zhing dga' la dga' mgur[7] spyod pa las | phyi zhig na de'i chung ma la bu chags nas | de[8] zla ba dgu 'am bcu lon

pa dang | khye'u gzugs bzang zhing blta na sdug la mdzes pa zhig btsas so || de nas de cher skyes pa dang | des yang dag par rdzogs pa'i sangs rgyas 'od srung gi[9] bstan pa la dad pa rnyed nas | des pha ma la gsol te |[1] rab tu byung ngo || rab tu byung nas sde snod gsum bslabs te | rig pa dang grol ba'i spobs pa[10] dang ldan pa'i chos smra bar gyur nas |[2] des pha ma gnyis dad pa phun sum tshogs pa la bkod de | skyabs su 'gro ba dang | blab pa'i gzhi rnams la gnas par byas so || sbyin pa dang sbyin pa'i bgo bsha' la yang[10] btsud do || phyi zhig na des bsams pa | bdag gis thos pa'i sgo nas bya ba gang yin pa de ni bdag gis byas zin gyis | ma la da ni bdag gis dge 'dun gyi zhal ta bya'o snyam du bsams nas | pha ma gnyis dang |[2] bram ze dang |[2] khyim bdag dad pa can gzhan dag la bskul te | dge 'dun la 'bras chan dang |[2] thug pa btung ba dang |[2] skyo ma rnams dang |[2] gos dang |[2] zas dang |[2] mal cha dang |[2] stan dang |[2] nad gsos dang |[2] sman zong rnams phul lo || khab kyang phul lo || de bzhin du dbu skra dang sen mo'i mchod rten rnams la yang til mar gyis byug pa dang |[2] spos kyis byug pa dang | mar me'i 'phreng ba dang |[2] sna ma'i me tog gi 'phreng[11] ba dang |[2] gdugs kyang phul |[2] sna ma'i me tog gi sil mas kyang gtor nas[6] smon lam btab pa | kye ma dge ba'i[12] rtsa ba 'dis na[6] bdag[13] gang dang gang du skye ba de dang der phyug cing nor mang la longs spyod che pa'i rigs su skye bar shog cig | gzugs bzang zhing blta na sdug la mdzes par shog cig | bdag gi lus thams cad nas[14] kyang sna ma'i me tog gi dri'i[15] ngad ldang bar shog cig | mngal du zhugs pa dang |[2] btsas pa'i tshe yang bdag gi khyim du sna ma'i me tog gi char 'bab par shog cig | yang dag par rdzogs pa'i sangs rgyas 'od srung gis[16] bram ze'i khye'u bla ma lung bstan pa gang yin pa'i sangs rgyas bcom ldan 'das de bdag gis mnyes par byed par gyur cig | mi mnyes par byed par ma gyur cig | de kho na'i bstan pa la rab tu byung nas | nyon mongs pa thams cad spangs te | dgra bcom pa nyid mngon sum du byed par gyur cig | shes rab kyang rno bar gyur cig | bsam gtan dang | rnam par thar pa dang | ting nge 'dzin dang | snyoms par 'jug pa rnams kyang thob ste | snyoms par 'jug pa dang ldang ba la myur bar gyur cig | khab lan re 'dzugs pa'i yun tsam la yang[6] ting nge 'dzin gzhan dang[6] gzhan dag la snyoms par 'jug cing ldang bar gyur cig ces byas so ||

1) S ø | 2) D ø | 3) D 'dul ba *for* gdul bya'i 4) S srungs 5) D bā rā ṇa sī 6) D + | 7) S dgur 8) D des 9) S srungs kyi *for* srung gi 10) S ø 11) D phreng 12) D pa'i 13) D ø 14) S ø 15) S dri 16) S srungs kyis

76. *Karmaśataka*, §1, *khyi mo*. D 340, *mdo sde, ha* 5a3–5b5; S 274, *mdo sde, ha* 7b5–8b5:

bcom ldan ’das kyis bka’ stsal pa | dge slong dag ’das pa’i las kyi shas kyang yod la |[1] da ltar byung ba’i las kyi shas kyang yod do || btsun pa ’das pa’i las ci bgyis lags | dge slong dag sngon byung ba ’das pa’i dus na | bskal pa bzang po ’di nyid la |[1] skye dgu’i tshe lo nyi khri thub pa na | de bzhin gshegs pa dgra bcom pa yang dag par rdzogs pa’i sangs rgyas rig pa dang zhabs su ldan pa |[1] bde bar gshegs pa |[1] ’jig rten mkhyen pa |[1] skyes bu gdul bya’i[2] kha lo sgyur ba | bla na med pa |[1] lha dang mi rnams kyi ston pa |[3] sangs rgyas bcom ldan ’das[4] ’od srung[5] zhes bya ba ’jig rten du byung ste | de’i tshe grong khyer wā rā ṇā si[6] na khyim bdag cig gnas pa las |[1] phyis de la bu mo gzugs bzang zhing blta na sdug la mdzes pa zhig btsas nas | gang gi tshe de chen mor gyur pa dang | des yang dag par rdzogs pa’i sangs rgyas ’od srung gi[7] bstan pa la dad pa rnyed nas |[1] pha ma la gsol te rab tu byung ngo ||

rab tu byung nas sde snod gsum bslabs te | de rig pa dang grol ba’i spobs pa dang ldan pa’i chos smra ba | gos dang |[1] zas dang |[1] mal cha dang |[1] stan dang |[1] nad gsos dang |[1] sman zong rnams rnyed par gyur nas |[1] des bsams pa |[1] ma la bdag gis rnyed pa dang bkur sti’i sgo nas[8] rnyed par bya ba rnyed pa gang yin pa des[8] bdag gis tshangs pa mtshungs par spyod pa rnams la phan gdags par bya gor ma chag snyam du bsams nas | chos bzhin du gnyis ka’i[9] dge ’dun gyi zhal ta byas so || des nas phyis de la brel ba zhig byung ste | des slob pa dang mi slob pa’i dge slong ma mang mo[10] zhig la gsol ba btab na | de dag na re bdag cag gi[11] dge ba’i phyogs btang ste | khyed[12] kyi don bsgrub par[13] mi nus so zhes zer ro ||

de nas de thos pa’i mod la dge slong ma de shin tu khro ba’i kun nas dkris pa skyes te | de khros nas dge slong ma de dag la smras pa | nga ni khyi mo dang ’dra ba khyed dgang ba dang |[1] gso ba ’ba’ zhig byed na |[1] khyed ni skad cig tsam bdag gi don byed du yang mi btub bam zhes byas so ||

de nas dge slong ma de rnams kyis bsams pa | nyon mongs ma ’di ni dmas[14] shing nyams par gyur te | ’khor ba na ’khor zhing sdug bsngal chen po rnyed na mi rung ngo snyam du bsams nas | ’di’i ra mda’ bya dgos so snyam ste |[1] de dag gis smras pa | khyod kyis nged su yin pa dang | khyod bdag su yin pa shes sam |[1]

des smras pa | ngas shes te khyed kyang rab tu byung ba yin la |[1] nga yang rab tu byung ba yin no ||

de dag gis smras pa | che zhe ’u bu cag rab tu byung bar ’dra mod kyi | khyod ni bcing ba thams cad kyis bcings pa’i so so’i skye bo yin la |[1] nged ni bya ba byas pa yin gyis |[1] nyes pa la nyes so zhes

bshags par gyis shig | khyod ’khor ba na ’khor zhing sdug bsngal chen po rnyed ta[15] re |

de skad thos pa’i mod la dge slong ma de ’gyod pa chen po skyes te | ’gyod pa chen po skyes nas[8] lhag par yang chos bzhin du gnyis ka’i[9] dge ’dun gyi zhal ta byas te |

1) D ø | 2) D ’dul ba *for* gdul bya’i 3) S ø | 4) S ø bcom ldan ’das 5) S srungs 6) D bā rā ṇa sī 7) S srungs kyi *for* srung gi 8) D + | 9) D gyis ga’i *for* gnyis ka’i 10) D po 11) S ø 12) D khyod 13) D ø 14) S smas 15) S da

77. *Karmaśataka*, §2, *mig chung*. D 340, *mdo sde, ha* 10a3–b7; S 274, *mdo sde, ha* 15a1–16a2:

dge slong dag sngon byung ba ’das pa’i dus na | bskal pa bzang po ’di nyid la skye dgu’i tshe lo nyi khri thub pa na | yang dag par rdzogs pa’i sangs rgyas rig pa dang zhabs su ldan pa |[1] bde bar gshegs pa |[1] ’jig rten mkhyen pa |[1] skyes bu gdul bya’i kha lo sgyur ba | bla na med pa |[1] lha dang mi rnams kyi ston pa[2] sangs rgyas bcom ldan ’das ’od srung[3] zhes bya ba ’jig rten du byung ste | de’i tshe grong khyer wā rā ṇā si[4] na | khyim bdag phyug cing nor mang la longs spyod che ba | yongs su ’dzin pa yangs shing rgya che ba | rnam thos kyi bu’i nor dang ldan pa | rnam thos kyi bu’i nor dang ’gran pa zhig gnas te | phyi zhig na de’i chung ma la bu chags nas | de zla ba dgu ’am bcu lon pa na |[5] khye’u gzugs bzang zhing[2] blta na sdug la mdzes pa zhig btsas nas | de gang gi tshe cher skyes pa de’i tshe | des yang dag par rdzogs pa’i sangs rgyas ’od srung gi[6] bstan pa la dad pa rnyed nas | pha ma la gsol te rab tu byung ngo || rab tu byung nas sde snod gsum bslabs te | de rig pa dang grol ba’i spobs dang ldan pa’i chos smra ba | gos dang |[1] zas dang |[1] mal cha dang |[1] stan dang |[1] nad gsos dang |[1] sman zong rnams rnyed par gyur nas | des bsams pa | ma la bdag gis rnyed pa dang bkur sti’i sgo nas rnyed par bya ba rnyed pa gang yin pa des | bdag gis tshangs pa mtshungs par spyod pa rnams la phan gdags par bya gor ma chag snyam du bsams nas |

chos bzhin du dge ’dun gyi zhal ta byas so ||[7] des nas phyi zhig na dge slong dgra bcom pa zhig la phyi dro’i gung skyems kyi zhal ta byed pa’i res bab nas | des dge ’dun la gung skyems brims pa’i ’og tu lus ngal te gnas khang du song nas skyil mo krung bcas te ’dug go ||[8] de nas zhal ta byed pa[9] de’i sbyin bdag rnams la gung skyems dgos par gyur nas | des dge slong gzhan dag la smras pa | der gung skyems kyi zhal ta byed pa’i res su la bab | de dag gis smras pa | dge slong che ge mo zhig la bab bo || de nas zhal ta byed pa de khros nas mig btsums te |[1] mig ’di ’dra ba de yin pa lta zhes smras so || de skad

smras nas[2] dgra bcom pa de ga la ba der song[10] ste phyin nas smras pa | btsun pa bdag ni khyed kyi phyir sbyin bdag dang | sbyin pa po rnams dga' bar byas nas | yo byad thams cad kyis bsnyen bkur byed na |[1] khyed ni bdag gi dad pas byin pa la longs spyad nas | khyi bzhin tshang du zhugs te[11] nyal zhing 'dug gam zhes byas so ||

de nas dgra bcom pa des bsams pa | nyon mongs pa 'di ni dmas[12] shing nyams par gyur te | 'khor ba na 'khor zhing sdug bsngal chen po rnyed na mi rung ngo snyam du bsams nas |[1]

'di'i ra mda' bya dgos so snyam ste | zhal ta byed pa de la smras pa | btsun pa khyod kyis nga su yin pa dang | khyod bdag su yin pa shes sam | des smras pa | ngas shes te[2] khyod kyang rab tu byung ba yin la |[1] nga yang rab tu byung ba yin no || dgra bcom pas smras pa | 'u bu cag gnyis rab tu byung bar 'dra mod kyi |[1] khyod ni bcing ba thams cad kyis bcings pa'i so so'i skye bo yin la | nga ni bcing ba thams cad las nges par grol ba'i dgra bcom pa yin na |[1] khyod kyis tshig rtsab po smras kyis |[1] nyes pa la nyes so zhes bshags par gyis shig | khyod 'khor ba na 'khor zhing sdug bsngal chen po rnyed ta[13] re | de skad thos pa'i mod la zhal ta byed pa de 'gyod pa chen po skyes te | 'gyod pa chen po skyes nas |

1) D ø | 2) D+ | 3) S srungs 4) D bā rā ṇa sī 5) D dang *for* na | 6) S srungs kyi
7) D te | *for* so || 8) D ø || 9) S pa'i 10) D dong 11) D nas 12) S smas 13) S da

78. *Karmaśataka*, §65, *glang*. D 340, *mdo sde, ha* 226a3–b1; S 274, *mdo sde, ha* 341a2–b2:

bcom ldan 'das kyis bka' stsal pa | dge slong dag 'di nyid kyis las de byas shing bsags te | dge slong dag sngon byung ba 'das pa'i dus na |[1] bskal pa bzang po 'di nyid la skye dgu'i tshe lo nyi khri thub pa na |[1] yang dag par rdzogs pa'i sangs rgyas rig pa dang zhabs su ldan pa | bde bar gshegs pa | 'jig rten mkhyen pa | skyes bu gdul bya'i kha lo sgyur ba | bla na med pa |[1] lha dang mi rnams kyi ston pa sangs rgyas bcom ldan 'das 'od srung[2] zhes bya ba 'jig rten du byung ste | de'i gsung rab la[3] rab tu byung nas |[4] dge slong chu'i zhal ta byed par gyur te | de dge 'dun la ril ba spyi blugs[5] kyis chu 'grim[6] pa las | dge slong dgra bcom pa gzhan zhig yengs par gyur te | de de dang thug nas |[1] chu'i zhal ta byed pa de'i ril ba lag nas shor te chag nas | de khros pas[7] dgra bcom pa de la smras pa | 'di ni glang dir po bzhin du che zhing tshor phrig med pa zhig go zhes byas nas | de'i tshig de dgra bcom pa des thos nas |[1] des de phyogs gcig tu khrid de smras pa | btsun pa khyod bdag su yin pa yang |[8] nga su yin pa shes sam |[1] des smras pa | ngas shes te[7] khyod kyang rab tu byung ba yin la | nga

yang[9] rab tu byung ba yin no || des smras pa | 'u[10] bu cag rab tu byung bar 'dra mod kyi | khyod ni bcing ba thams cad kyis bcings pa'i so so'i skye bo yin la | nga ni bcing[11] ba thams cad las grol ba yin na | khyod kyis tshig rtsub po smras kyis | nyes pa la nyes so zhes bshags par gyis shig | khyod 'khor ba na 'khor zhing mi sdug pa'i las kyi 'bras bu rnyed ta[12] re zhes byas so ||

1) D ø | 2) S srungs 3) S + 'di 4) D ste *for* nas | 5) S lugs 6) D 'drim 7) D + | 8) D dang *for* yang | 9) S nga'ang *for* nga yang 10) D 'o 11) D 'ching 12) S da

79. *Karmaśataka*, §71, *wa*. D 340, *mdo sde, ha* 245b2–246b7; S 274, *mdo sde, ha* 369b2–371b1:

bcom ldan 'das kyis bka' stsal pa | dge slong dag 'di nyid kyis las de lta bu byas shing bsags te | dge slong dag sngon byung ba 'das pa'i dus na | bskal pa bzang po 'di nyid la skye dgu'i tshe lo nyi khri thub pa na | yang dag par rdzogs pa'i sangs rgyas rig pa dang zhabs su ldan pa |[1] bde bar gshegs pa | 'jig rten mkhyen pa | skyes bu gdul bya'i kha lo sgyur ba | bla na med pa |[1] lha dang mi rnams kyi ston pa sangs rgyas bcom ldan 'das 'od srung[2] zhes bya ba 'jig rten du byung ste | de'i tshe grong khyer wā rā ṇā si[3] na | khyim bdag phyug cing nor mang la longs spyod che ba | yongs su 'dzin pa yangs shing rgya che ba |[1] rnam thos kyi bu'i nor dang ldan pa | rnam thos kyi bu'i nor dang 'gran pa zhig gnas pa las | phyi zhig na de sangs rgyas la dga' ba dang |[1] chos la dga' ba dang |[1] dge 'dun la dga' bar gyur nas | skyabs su 'gro ba dang |[1] blabs pa'i gzhi rnams blangs te | phyir mi 'ong ba'i 'bras bu mngon sum du byas nas |[1] des bsams pa | bdag la bu yang[4] med | bu mo 'ang[5] med pas shi ste dus las 'das pa'i 'og tu bdag la ci bdog pa thams cad rgyal po dbang bar[6] byed par 'gyur[7] na | ma la bdag gis sangs rgyas dang |[1] chos dang |[1] dge 'dun la bkur sti bya'o snyam ste | des rnam pa thams cad yongs su rdzogs pa'i gtsug lag khang brtsigs nas |[1] yo byad thams cad sbyar te | dge slong rnams la yo byad thams cad kyis bsnyen bkur byas nas |[1] der dge slong zhal ta pa bskos so ||

de nas phyi zhig na[8] zhal ta pa[9] de ljongs su bya ba zhig yod de | khyim bdag de la bzlugs nas song ngo || de der song ba'i 'og tu dgra bcom pa zhig ljongs rgyu zhing song ba las |[1] gtsug lag khang der phyin te | khyim bdag des de mdzes shing g-yog 'khor mdzes pa mthong nas | mthong ma thag tu khyim bdag de |[1] de la shin tu dga' bar gyur te | dga' bar gyur nas |[1] des bsams pa | gal te bdag gis 'di gcig pu spyan drangs na ni gnang bar mi 'gyur na | ma la bdag gis 'di[10] kho na'i phyir dge slong gi dge 'dun khyim du

spyan drangs la |[1] bshos gsol lo snyam nas |[1] de'i rkang pa la phyag 'tshal te smras pa | 'phags pa khyod dge slong gi dge 'dun dang bcas par sang bdag gi khyim du bshos gsol bar ci gnang zhes byas so ||

de nas dgra bcom pa des bsams pa | gal te bdag gis khas ma blangs na ni dge slong 'di rnams kyi rnyed pa'i bar chad du yang[5] 'gyur la | sbyin bdag 'di'i bsod nams kyi bar chad du yang[5] 'gyur ro snyam nas |[1] des de la cang mi gsung bas[11] gnang ngo || de nas khyim bdag des phyid[12] nyin dge slong gi dge 'dun gyi phyir[8] khyim du cho ga dang ldan pa'i khrus dang |[1] mal cha dang |[1] stan bshams te | chu ra bcas nas dge slong rnams la spyan 'dren btang ste | 'phags pa rnams gdugs tshod dang cho ga dang ldan pa'i khrus la bab na | 'phags pa rnams kyis da de'i dus la bab par mkhyen par mdzad du gsol zhes bskul lo[13] || de nas dge slong rnams de'i khyim du lhags nas | khyim bdag des 'dreg mkhan bkug ste | dge slong rnams[14] kyi skra 'dreg tu bcug nas |[1] cho ga dang ldan pa'i khrus kyis khrus byed du bcug ste | rang gi lag nas bza' ba dang bca' ba gtsang ma bzang po mang[15] pos tshim par byas so ||

dge slong zhal ta pa de yang[5] ljongs su don bsgrubs nas | gtsug lag khang der phyir 'ongs so || de phyir 'ongs nas[8] dge slong de dag mi snang na gar dong zhes dris pa dang |[1] de dag gis smras pa | khyim bdag gis khyim du spyan drangs so ||

des smras pa | su'i phyir spyan drangs |

de dag gis smras pa | dge slong zhig gsar du 'ongs pa'i phyir spyan drangs so ||

de nas de thos ma thag tu de shas cher mi dga' bar gyur te | de'i bya ba thams cad byed pa ni nga yin na | dge slong gsar du 'ongs pa zhig gi phyir[8] des dge slong gi dge 'dun spyan drangs so snyam du rig nas |[1] khros te[8] khyim bdag de'i khyim du son ngo || de der song nas bltas na |[1] khyim bdag de rang nyid dgra bcom pa de la gus par bsnyen bkur byed pa mthong ngo || de nas de lhag par phrag dog gi phyir khros so ||

der dge slong rnams bshos gsol nas | gtsug lag khang du dong ba de'i tshe |[1] dgra bcom pa de'i thad du song nas smras pa | btsun pa khyod kyis khyim bdag 'di ltar byed pa 'di su yin shes sam |

dgra bcom pas smras pa | ngas shes te | phyir mi 'ong ba yin no ||

zhal ta byed pas smras pa | gal te de lta[16] na khyod kyis de la[17] skra breg[18] pa nyams su blangs pa bas ni | khyod kyi skra btog[19] kyang slo'o[20] || khyod kyis de la[17] khrus kyi yo byad blangs pa bas ni | khyod phyi sa'i 'dam du bying yang sla'o[20] || khyod kyis de las zas

dang skom blangs pa bas ni | khyod kyi phyi sa dang gcin zos shing 'thungs kyang sla'o[20] zhes byas so ||

de nas dgra bcom pa des bsams pa |[1] nyon mongs pa 'di ni dmas[21] shing nyams par gyur te |

gtan du[22] nyams par gyur na mi rung gis |[1] 'di'i ra mda' bya dgos so snyam nas | de la smras pa | tshe dang ldan pa khyod kyis nga su yin pa dang |[1] khyod bdag su yin pa shes sam | des smras pa | bdag gis shes te |[1] khyod kyang rab tu byung ba yin |[1] nga yang[5] rab tu byung ba yin no || dgra com pas smras pa | 'u[23] bu cag rab tu byung bar 'dra mod kyi | khyod ni so so'i skye bo bcing ba thams cad[24] kyis bcings pa yin la[25] | nga ni dgra bcom pa bcing ba thams cad las grol ba yin no || khyod kyis ngag rtsub po smras kyis | nyes pa la nyes so zhes bshags par gyis shig | khyod 'khor ba na 'khor zhing sdug bsngal chen po rnyed ta[26] re | de nas de thos ma thag tu dge slong de 'gyod pa chen po skyes so ||

1) D ø | 2) S srungs 3) D bā rā ṇa sī 4) S bu'ang 5) S 'ang 6) D ø bar 7) D gyur 8) D + | 9) D ba 10) D de 11) S + smra bas 12) D phyi de *for* phyid 13) D to 14) D thams cad *for* rnams 15) S ø po mang 16) D ltar 17) D las 18) D bregs 19) D btogs 20) S blo'o 21) S smas 22) D tu 23) D 'o 24) S + de 25) D te 26) S da

80. *Saṁgharakṣitāvadāna*. T. 749 (XVII) 569c21–27:

迦葉佛時。是出家人爲僧寺主。當典内外事事撿挍。不敕弟子。諸小比丘不如法打稚。諸律師等白言。寺主、何不時節鳴稚集僧。比丘答言。我當營僧事、甚成勞苦。汝諸比丘猶如羝羊、燠食而住。何不自打。以是因緣入地獄中、受羝羊形。火燒痛毒受苦至今不息。

81. *Karmaśataka*, §38, *gcod pa*. D 340, *mdo sde, ha* 147a6–b6; S 274, *mdo sde, ha* 216b5–217b3:

de nas bcom ldan 'das kyis |[1] tshe dang ldan pa mo'u 'gal[2] gyi bu chen po la bka' stsal pa | mo'u 'gal[2] gyi bu sems can de ni sdig pa byed byed pa yin te | des sdig pa mang du byas so || mo'u 'gal[2] gyi bu sngon byung ba 'das pa'i dus na | bskal pa bzang po 'di nyid la |[1] skye dgu'i tshe lo nyi khri thub pa na | yang dag par rdzogs pa'i sangs rgyas rig pa dang zhabs su ldan pa | bde bar gshegs pa | 'jig rten mkhyen pa | skyes bu gdul bya'i kha lo sgyur ba | bla na med pa |[1] lha dang mi rnams kyi ston pa[3] sangs rgyas bcom ldan 'das 'od srung[4] zhes bya ba 'jig rten du byung ste | de'i bstan pa la sems can 'di rab tu byung nas zhal ta byed par gyur te | des der dge slong dbyar gnas bcas pa rnams kyi gos dang rnyed pa rnams bcad de |[1] dgun gnas bcas[5] pa rnams la phul | dgun gnas bcas pa rnams kyi

gos dang rnyed pa rnams bcad de |[1] dbyar gnas bcas pa rnams la phul |[1] gnyis ka[6] las bcad de kha cig ni bdag nyid kyis spyad | kha cig ni gzhan dag la phul lo || mo'u 'gal[2] gyi bu ji snyam du sems |[1] de'i tshe zhal ta byed par gyur pa gang yin pa de ni yi dags 'di kho na yin te | des der dbyar gnas bcas pa rnams kyi gos dang rnyed pa rnams bcad de |[1] dgun gnas bcas pa rnams la phul | dgun gnas bcas pa rnams kyi gos dang rnyed pa rnams bcad de | dbyar gnas bcas pa rnams la phul ba'i las de'i rnam par smin pas ni rked pa yan chad lus gnyis su 'dug par gyur te | las las skyes pa'i mi rnams de'i drung du lhags nas | de dag gi[7] ral 'gri[8] rnon pos de'i ro stod gcod par byed de | de'i ro stod gcig bcad na cig shos 'byung bar 'gyur la | cig shos bcad na yang gcig 'byung bar 'gyur ro || de gnyis ka[6] las bcad de kha cig ni bdag nyid kyis spyad | kha cig ni gzhan dag la phul ba'i las de'i rnam par smin pas ni lcags kyi mche ba can gyi seng ge dang |[1] stag dang |[1] gzig dang |[1] dred la sogs pa byung nas | de dag gis de'i sha rnams bcad cing bcad cing za bar gyur to ||

1) D ø | 2) D maud gal 3) D + | 4) S srungs 5) D ø 6) D gnyi ga 7) D gis 8) D gri

82. *Karmaśataka*, §39, *za ba*. D 340, *mdo sde, ha* 149b3–7; S 274, *mdo sde, ha* 220a7–b7:

bcom ldan 'das kyis bka' stsal pa | mo'u 'gal[1] gyi bu sems can de ni sdig pa byed byed pa yin te |[2] des sdig pa'i las mang du byas so || mo'u 'gal[1] gyi bu sngon byung ba 'das pa'i dus na | bskal pa bzang po 'di nyid la |[2] skye dgu'i tshe lo nyi khri thub pa na | yang dag par rdzogs pa'i sangs rgyas rig pa dang zhabs su ldan pa | bde bar gshegs pa | 'jig rten mkhyen pa | skyes bu gdul bya'i kha lo sgyur ba | bla na med pa |[2] lha dang mi rnams kyi ston pa[3] sangs rgyas bcom ldan 'das 'od srung[4] zhes bya ba 'jig rten du byung ste | de'i gsung rab la sems can[5] de rab tu byung nas | dge slong zhal ta byed par gyur te |[2] des der sbyin bdag dang |[2] sbyin pa po mang po dag la bskul nas |[2] dge 'dun dang mchod rten gyi phyir bslangs te | des dge 'dun gyi dkor dang |[2] mchod rten gyi dkor dang |[2] 'tsho ba nar ma dang |[2] phyogs bzhi'i dge 'dun gyi dkor ma thub nas |[2] thams cad ci dga' mgur[6] spyad la |[2] gzhan dag la yang byin te | des der dge 'dun las bcad nas |[2] bdag nyid kyis kyang ci dga' mgur[6] spyad la gzhan dag la yang byin pa'i las de'i rnam par smin pas yi dags kyi nang du skyes nas | der nam mkha' la gnas pa dang |[2] chu la gnas pa dang |[2] thang la gnas pa'i srog chags rnams kyis bza' bar gyur to ||

1) D maud gal 2) D ø | 3) D + | 4) S srungs 5) D dad 6) S dgur

83. *Karmaśataka*, §41, *snag bu*. D 340, *mdo sde, ha* 153b7–154a5; S 274, *mdo sde, ha* 227a1–b3:

bcom ldan 'das kyis bka' stsal pa | mo'u 'gal[1] gyi bu sems can de ni sdig pa'i las byed byed pa yin te |[2] des sdig pa'i las mang du byas so || mo'u 'gal[1] gyi bu sngon byung ba 'das pa'i dus na |[2] sems can de yang dag par rdzogs pa'i sangs rgyas 'od srung gi[3] bstan pa la rab tu byung ste |[2] dge slong zhal ta byed par gyur nas | des der dge 'dun gyi dkor dang |[2] mchod rten gyi dkor dang |[2] 'tsho ba nar ma dang |[2] phyogs bzhi'i dge 'dun gyi dkor gang zag gcig pus spyad la | kha cig ni bsags te bzhag pa las |[4] phyi zhig na nad kyis thebs na des nor de dag nye du rnams la sbyin par byas pa dang |[5] dge slong dag gis mthong nas bkag pa las |[2] de 'di snyam du sems te | gal te 'di dag gis bkag pa lta na | bdag gis ci nas de dag la yang mi phan la |[2] bdag la yang mi phan par bya'o snyam mo || de nas de khros pas nor de dag thams cad mes bsregs so || de'i og tu de de nas shi 'phos te |[2] shi nas yi dags su skyes te | des der dge 'dun gyi dkor dang |[2] mchod rten gyi dkor dang |[2] 'tsho ba nar ma dang |[2] phyogs bzhi'i dge 'dun gyi dkor gang zag gcig pus spyad pa'i las de'i rnam par smin pas ni[6] lus sha'i[7] snag gu 'dra la gtsang khang phyur po tsam du gyur nas |[2] srog chags khab kyi mchu can dag gis bza' bar gyur to || des der dge 'dun gyi dkor dang |[2] mchod rten gyi dkor dang |[2] 'tsho ba nar ma dang |[2] phyogs bzhi'i dge 'dun gyi dkor mes bsregs pa'i las de'i rnam par smin pas ni gal te steng gi nam mkha' la phags na yang lus mer[8] 'bar bar 'gyur te | sems can des las de lta bu byas pas na |[2] las de'i rnam par smin pas sdug bsngal de lta bu nyams su myong ngo ||

1) D maud gal 2) D ø | 3) S srungs kyi 4) D de *for* | 5) D + de 6) D + | 7) S sha 8) S me

84. *Karmaśataka*, §53, *dgon pa pa*. D 340, *mdo sde, ha* 186b5–187a3; S 274, *mdo sde, ha* 279a5–b6:

bcom ldan 'das kyis bka' stsal pa | dge slong dag sngon byung ba 'das pa'i dus na | bskal pa bzang po 'di nyid la skye dgu'i tshe lo nyi khri thub pa na | yang dag par rdzogs pa'i sangs rgyas rig pa dang zhabs su ldan pa | bde bar gshegs pa | 'jig rten mkhyen pa | skyes bu gdul bya'i kha lo sgyur ba | bla na med pa | lha dang mi rnams kyi ston pa sangs rgyas bcom ldan 'das 'od srung[1] zhes bya ba 'jig rten du byung ste | de'i gsung rab la rab tu byung ste | dge slong zhal ta byed pa 'du 'dzi mang bar gyur nas | 'du 'dzi'i nyes pa des tshul khrims 'chal bar[2] gyur te | tshul khrims 'chal pa dang | des dge 'dun gyi dkor dang |[3] mchod rten gyi dkor dang | 'tsho ba nar ma dang |[3]

phyogs bzhi'i dge 'dun gyi dkor ma thub nas | ci 'dod par spyad de gzhan dag la yang byin no || dge slong dag ji snyam du sems | de'i tshe zhal ta byed par gyur pa gang yin pa de ni[4] dge slong 'di kho na yin te | de der rab tu byung nas dge 'dun gyi dkor dang |[3] mchod rten gyi dkor dang |[3] 'tsho ba nar ma dang |[3] phyogs bzhi'i dge 'dun gyi dkor ma thub nas | ci 'dod par spyad de | gzhan dag la yang byin nas | khong dge ba rnams la dor byas pa'i las de'i rnam par smin pas[4] 'di tshe rabs lnga brgyar yi dags su skyes te |[3] sdug bsngal chen po nyams su myong ngo ||

1) S srungs 2) D par 3) D ø | 4) D + |

Bibliography

Abe Fumio 阿部文雄. 1935. "Chibettoyakuden *Karumashataka* (Karma Śataka) ni tsuite" 西藏譯傳「カルマシャタカ」 (Karma Śataka) に就いて [On the *Karmaśataka* in Tibetan Translation]. *Bukkyō Gakkai Nenpō, Komazawa Daigaku Gakuhō* 佛教學會年報・駒澤大學々報 6/1: 151–186.

Abe, Stanley K. 2002. *Ordinary Images* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press).

Agrawala, V. S. 1966. "Some Obscure Words in the Divyāvadāna." *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 86/2: 67–75.

Aiyar, Pandit V. Natesa. 1925–1926a. "An Inscribed Relic Casket from Kurram." *Epigraphia Indica* 18 (Calcutta: Manager, Government of India Central Publication Branch): 16–20.

———. 1925–1926b. "Inscribed Buddhist Image from Gopalpur." *Epigraphia Indica* 18 (Calcutta: Manager, Government of India Central Publication Branch): 73–74.

Aiyer, K. V. Subrahmanya. 1937. "A Note on the Panchavara Committee." *Epigraphia Indica* 23/1 (Delhi: Manager of Publications): 22–28.

Akanuma Chizen 赤沼智善. 1931. *Indo Bukkyō Koyū Meishi Jiten* 印度佛教固有名詞辭典 (Reprint: Kyoto: Hōzōkan 法藏館, 1967).

Bacot, Jacques. 1930. *Dictionnaire Tibétain-Sanskrit par Tse-ring-ouang-gyal*. Buddhica, Deuxième série, Documents, Tome 2 (Paris: Librairie Orientaliste Paul Geuthner).

Bailey, H[arold] W. 1949. "Indo-Iranica II." *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 13/1: 121–139.

———. 1957. "Adversaria Indoiranica." *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 19/1: 49–57.

Ba Kyaw, U, and Peter Masefield. 1980. *Elucidation of the Intrinsic Meaning, So Named the Commentary on the Peta-Stories (Paramatthadīpanī nāma Petavatthu-aṭṭhakathā) by Dhammapāla*. Sacred Books of the Buddhists 34 (London: Pali Text Society).

Baldissera, Fabrizia. 2005. *The Narmamālā of Kṣemendra: Critical Edition: Study and Translation*. Beiträge zur Südasienforschung, Südasien-Institut, Universität Heidelberg 197 (Heidelberg: Ergon Verlag).

Banerjee, Anukul Chandra. 1957. *Sarvāstivāda Literature* (Calcutta: K. L. Mukhopadhyay).

———. 1977. *Two Buddhist Vinaya Texts in Sanskrit* (Calcutta: The World Press Private Limited).

Banerji, Adris. 1948. "Epigraphical Notes: An Abbot of Nalanda." *Journal of the Bihar Research Society* 34/1–2: 111–116.

Banerji, R. D. 1913–1914. "The Tarpandighi Grant of Lakshmana Sena." *Epigraphia Indica* 12 (Calcutta: Superintendent Government Printing, India): 6–10.

———. 1917–1918. "The Naihati Grant of Vallala-sena: The 11th Year." *Epigraphia Indica* 14 (Calcutta: Superintenent Government Printing, India): 156–163.

———. 1925. "Barrackpur Grant of Vijayasena: The 32nd Year." *Epigraphia Indica* 15 (Calcutta: Government of India Central Publication Branch): 278–286.

Bapat, P[urośottam] V[iśvanath], and V. V. Gokhale. 1982. *Vinaya-sūtra*. Tibetan Sanskrit Works Series 22 (Patna: Kashi Prasad Jayaswal Research Institute).

Bapat, P[urośottam] V[iśvanath], and A[kira] Hirakawa. 1970. *Shan-Chien-P'i-P'o-Sha: A Chinese Version by Saṅghabhadra of Samantapāsādikā*. Bhandarkar Oriental Series 10 (Poona: Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute).

Bareau, André. 1955. *Les Sectes Bouddhiques du Petit Véhicule*. Publications de l'École française d'Extrême-Orient 38 (Paris: École française d'Extrême-Orient).

Barnett, Lionel D. 1913–1914a. "Inscriptions at Yewur." *Epigraphia Indica* 12 (Calcutta: Superintendent Government Printing, India): 268–291.

———. 1913–1914b. "Nilgunda Plates of Vikramaditya VI, A.D. 1087 and 1123." *Epigraphia Indica* 12 (Calcutta: Superintendent Government Printing, India): 142–155.

Barrett, T[imothy] H. 1996. "The Fate of Buddhist Political Thought in China: The Rajah Dons a Disguise." In Tadeusz Skorupski, ed., *The Buddhist Forum: Vol. 4. Seminar Papers 1994–1996* (London: School of Oriental and African Studies, University of London): 1–7.

Barua, Benimadhab. 1929. *Old Brāhmī Inscriptions in the Udayagiri and Khaṇḍagiri Caves* (Calcutta: University of Calcutta).

Barua, Dipak Kumar. 1969. *Vihāras in Ancient India: A Survey of Buddhist Monasteries*. Indian Publications Monograph Series 10 (Calcutta: Indian Publications).

Basak, Radhagovinda. 1913–1914a. "Belava Copper-plate of Bhojavarmadeva: The Fifth Year." *Epigraphia Indica* 12 (Calcutta: Superintendent Government Printing, India): 37–43.

———. 1913–1914b. "Rampal Copper-plate Grant of Srichandradeva." *Epigraphia Indica* 12 (Calcutta: Superintendent Government Printing, India): 136–142.

Beal, S[amuel], and D[aniel] J[ohn] Gogerly. 1862. "Comparative Arrangement of Two Translations of the Buddhist Ritual for the Priesthood, Known as the Prátimoksha, or Pátimokhan." *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland* 19: 407–480.

Bendall, Cecil. 1897–1902. *Çikshāsamuccaya: A Compendium of Buddhistic Teaching Compiled by Çāntideva, Chiefly from Earlier Mahāyāna-sūtras*. Bibliotheca Buddhica 1 (St. Petersburg: Imperial Academy. Reprint: Osnabrück, Biblio Verlag, 1970).

Bendall, Cecil, and W[illiam] H[enry] D[enham] Rouse. 1922. *Śikṣā-samuccaya: A Compendium of Buddhist Doctrine* (London. Reprint: New Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1971).

Beyer, Stephan V. 1992. *The Classical Tibetan Language* (Albany: State University of New York Press).

Bhandarkar, Ramkrishna Gopal. 1872. "On Two Copperplates from Valabhi." *Indian Antiquary* 1: 45–46.

Bhattacharyya, P. N. 1938. "Nalanda Plate of Dharmapaladeva." *Epigraphia Indica* 23/7 (Delhi: Manager of Publications): 290–292.

Bhattacharya, Vidhushekhara. 1957. *The Yogācārabhūmi of Ācārya Asaṅga: The Sanksrit Text Compared with the Tibetan Version* (Calcutta: University of Calcutta).

Biku Igihō Kenkyūkai 比丘威儀法研究会/Abhisamācārika-Dharma Study Group. 1998. *Daishubusetsu Shusseburitsu Biku Igihō: Bonbun Shahon Eiinban Tebiki* 『大衆部説出世部律比丘威儀法』梵文写本影印版手引/*A Guide to the Facsimile Edition of the* Abhisamācārika-Dharma *of the Mahāsāṁghika-Lottaravādin* (Tokyo: Taishō Daigaku Sōgō Bukkyō Kenkyūsho 大正大学総合仏教研究所).

———. 1999. "Transcription of the Abhisamācārika-Dharma Chapter V–VII." *Taishō Daigaku Sōgō Bukkyō Kenkyūsho Nenpō* 大正大学総合仏教研究所年報 21: 234–156 (1–79).

Bloch, Th[eodor]. 1895. "An Unpublished Valabhī Copper-plate Inscription of King Dhruvasena I." *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society* 1895: 379–384.

Bodhi, Bhikkhu. 2000. *The Connected Discourses of the Buddha: A New Translation of the Saṁyutta Nikāya* (Boston: Wisdom).

Bodiford, William. 1996. "Zen and the Art of Religious Prejudice: Efforts to Reform a Tradition of Social Discrimination." *Japanese Journal of Religious Studies* 23/1–2: 1–27.

Böhtlingk, Otto von. 1879–1889. *Sanskrit-Wörterbuch in kürzerer Fassung* (St. Petersburg: Kaiserliche Akademie der Wissenschaften).

Böhtlingk, Otto, and Rudolph Roth. 1855–1875. *Sanskrit-Wörterbuch* (St. Petersburg: Kaiserliche Akademie der Wissenschaften).

Boyer, A[uguste] M., E[dward] J[ames] Rapson, E[mile] Senart, and P. S. Noble. 1920–1929. *Kharoṣṭhī Inscriptions Discovered by Sir Aurel Stein in Chinese Turkestan*. 3 parts (part 3 by Rapson and Noble) (Oxford: Clarendon).

Braarvig, Jens. 2000. "Sarvadharmāpravr̥ttinirdeśa." In Jens Braarvig, Jens-Uwe Hartmann, Kazunobu Matsuda, and Lore Sander, eds., *Buddhist Manuscripts* Vol. 1. Manuscripts in the Schøyen Collection I (Oslo: Hermes): 81–166.

Bstan 'dzin rnam rgyal. 1976. *Raṅ blo gsal ba'i me loṅ las mnoṅ brjod kyi bstan bcos bsam 'phel nor bu/A Detailed Dictionary of Sanskrit Equivalents for Various Tibetan Terms* (Thimpu, Bhutan: Kunzang Topgey).

Btsan lha Ngag dbang tshul khrims. 1997. *Brda dkrol gser gyi me long* (Beijing: Minzu chubanshe 民族出版社).

Bühler, G[eorg]. 1875a. "A Grant of King Dhruvasena I of Valabhī." *Indian Antiquary* 4: 104–107.

———. 1875b. "A Grant of King Guhasena of Valabhī." *Indian Antiquary* 4: 174–176.

———. 1877. "Further Valabhî Grants." *Indian Antiquary* 6: 9–21.

———. 1880. "Valabhî Grants." *Indian Antiquary* 9: 237–239.

———. 1885. "The Banawasi Inscription of Hariputa-Satakamni." *The Indian Antiquary* 14: 331–334.

———. 1896–1897. "Taxila Plate of Patika." *Epigraphia Indica* 4 (Calcutta: Office of the Superintendent of Government Printing, India): 54–57.

Burgess, James. 1883a. *Report on the Buddhist Cave Temples and Their Inscriptions*. Archaeological Survey of Western India 4 (London: Trübner & Co.).

———. 1883b. *Report on the Elura Cave Temples and the Brahmanical and Jaina Caves in Western India*. Archaeological Survey of Western India 5 (London: Trübner).

———. 1887. *The Buddhist Stupas of Amaravati and Jaggayyapeta in the Krishna District, Madras Presidency, surveyed in 1882*. Archeological Survey of Southern India 1 (London Reprint: Varanasi: Indological Book House, 1970).

Burnouf, Eugène. 1844. *Introduction à l'Histoire du Buddhisme Indien* (Paris: Imprimerie Royal).

———. 1876. *Introduction à l'Histoire du Buddhisme Indien*. 2nd ed. Bibliothèque Oriental 3 (Paris: Maisonneuve).

Burrow, T[homas]. 1937. *The Language of the Kharoṣṭhi Documents from Chinese Turkestan* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).

———. 1940. *A Translation of the Kharoṣṭhi Documents from Chinese Turkestan* (London: Royal Asiatic Society).

———. 1944. "The Term *Agiśala* in Two Kharoṣṭhī Inscriptions." *Journal of the Greater India Society* 11/1: 13–16.

Bussho Kankōkai 佛書刊行會, ed. 1914. *Dainippon Bukkyō Zensho* 大日本佛教全書 2: *Bukkyō Shoseki Mokuroku* 佛教書籍目録 2 (Tokyo: Bussho Kankōkai 佛書刊行會).

Buswell, Robert E., Jr. 1992. *The Zen Monastic Experience: Buddhist Practice in Contemporary Korea* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press).

Caillat, Colette. 1965. *Les expiations dans le rituel ancien des religieux Jaina* (Paris: Éditions E. de Boccard).

———. 1975. *Atonements in the Ancient Ritual of the Jaina Monks*. L. D. Series 49 (Ahmedabad: L. D. Institute of Indology).

Callieri, Pierfrancesco. 1997. *Seals and Sealings from the North-west of the Indian Subcontinent and Afghanistan (4th Century BC–11th Century AD): Local, Indian, Sasanian, Graeco-Persian, Sogdian, Roman*. Istituto Universitario Orientale, Dissertationes 1 (Naples: Istituto Universitario Orientale, Istituto Italiano per l'Africa e l'Oriente).

Carter, John Ross, and Mahinda Palihawadana. 1987. *The Dhammapada: A New English Translation with the Pali Text and the First English Translation of the Commentary's Explanation of the Verses with Notes Translated from Sinhala Sources and Critical Textual Comments* (New York: Oxford University Press).

Cassinelli, C. W., and Robert B. Ekvall. 1969. *A Tibetan Principality: The Political System of Sa sKya* (Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press).

Chanda, Ramāprasād. 1925. "Some Unpublished Amaravati Inscriptions." *Epigraphia Indica* 15 (Calcutta: Government of India Central Publication Branch): 258–275.

Chandra, K. R. 1970. *A Critical Study of Paumacariyaṁ*. Prakrit Jain Institute Research Publications Series 4 (Vaishali: Research Institute of Prakrit, Jainology and Ahimsa).

Chang, Kun. 1957. *A Comparative Study of the Kaṭhinavastu*. Indo-Iranian Monographs I (The Hague: Mouton).

Charpentier, Jarl. 1910. "Studien über die indische Erzählungsliteratur." *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft* 64: 65–83.

Chavannes, Emmanuel Édouard. 1894. *Mémoire Composé à l'Époque de la Grande Dynastie T'ang sur les Religieux Éminents qui Allèrent Chercher la Loi dans les Pays d'Occident par I-Tsing* (Paris: Ernest Leroux).

———. 1910–1911, 1934. *Cinq Cents Contes et Apologues Extraits du Tripiṭaka Chinois et Traduits en Français* (Paris: Ernest Leroux).

Chen, Chin-chih. 2004. "Fan Fan-yü: Ein Sanskrit-chinesisches Wörterbuch aus dem Taishō-Tripiṭaka." Ph.D. diss., Friedrich-Wilhelms University, Bonn.

Ch'en, Kenneth. 1953. "Apropos the Mendhaka Story." *Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies* 16/3–4: 374–403.

Childers, Robert Caesar. 1875. *A Dictionary of the Pali Language* (London: Kegan, Paul, Trench, Trübner. Reprint of 1909 edition: Rangoon: Buddha Sāsana Council Press, 1974).

Chimpa, Lama, and Alaka Chattopadhyaya. 1980. *Tāranātha's History of Buddhism in India* (Calcutta: K P Bagchi).

Chos kyi grags pa. 1981. *Dge bshes chos kyi grags pas brtsams pa'i brda dag ming tshig gsal ba bzhugs so* (Lhasa, 1949. Peking, 1957. Reprint: Peking: Minzu chubanshe 民族出版社).

Chung, Jin-il. 1998. *Die Pravāraṇā in den kanonischen Vinaya-Texten der Mūlasarvāstivādin und der Sarvāstivādin*. Sanskrit-Wörterbuch der buddhistischen Texte aus den Turfan-Funden, Beiheft 7 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht).

Chung, Jin-il, and Klaus Wille. 1997. "Einige Bhikṣuvinayavibhaṅga-Fragmente der Dharmaguptakas in der Sammlung Pelliot." In Heinz Bechert, Sven Bretfeld, and Petra Kieffer-Pülz, eds., *Untersuchungen zur buddhistischen Literatur: Zweite Folge, Gustav Roth zum 80. Geburtstag gewidmet*. Sanskrit-Wörterbuch der buddhistischen Texte aus den Turfan-Funden, Beiheft 8 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht): 47–94.

Clarke, Shayne Neil. 1999. "Pārājika: The Myth of Permanent and Irrevocable Expulsion from the Buddhist Monastic Order: A Survey of the Śikṣādattaka in Early Monastic Buddhism." Master's thesis, University of Canterbury.

———. 2000. "The Existence of the Supposedly Non-existent *Śikṣādattā-śrāmaṇerī*: A New Perspective on *Pārājika* Penance." *Bukkyō Kenkyū* 佛教研究 29: 149–176.

———. 2004. "*Vinaya Mātṛkā*—Mother of the Monastic Codes, or Just Another Set of Lists? A Response to Frauwallner's Handling of the Mahāsāṁghika *Vinaya*" *Indo-Iranian Journal* 47: 77–120.

———. 2007. "Flogging a Dead Horse: The Myth of Permanent and Irrevocable Expulsion from the Buddhist Monastic Order." Unpublished paper.

Cole, Alan. 1998. *Mothers and Sons in Chinese Buddhism* (Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press).

Collcutt, Martin. 1981. *Five Mountains: The Rinzai Zen Monastic Institution in Medieval Japan*. Harvard East Asian Monographs 85 (Cambridge, Mass.: Council on East Asian Studies, Harvard University).

Cowell, E[dward] B[yles], and R[obert] A[lexander] Neil. 1886. *The Divyāvadāna: A Collection of Early Buddhist Legends* (Cambridge. Reprint: Amsterdam: Oriental Press/Philo, 1970).

Cowell, Edward Byles, et al. 1895–1907. *The Jātaka; or, Stories of the Buddha's Former Births*, 6 vols. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. Reprint: London: Pali Text Society, 1981).

Csoma de Kőrös, Alexander. 1910, 1916, 1944. *Sanskrit-Tibetan English Vocabulary: Being an Edition and Translation of the Mahāvyutpatti* (Calcutta: Asiatic Society/Royal Asiatic Society of Bengal). Reprinted in the *Collected Works of Alexander Csoma de Kőrös* (Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó, 1984).

Cunningham, Alexander. 1854. *The Bhilsa Topes; or, Buddhist Monuments of Central India: Comprising a Brief Historical Sketch of the Rise, Progress, and Decline of Buddhism; with an Account of the Opening and Examination of the Various Groups of Topes around Bhilsa* (Bombay: Smith, Taylor/London: Smith, Elder).

Dagyab, Loden Sherap. 1980. "Die Verwaltung des Bezirkes Brag-g.yab (= Dagyab, Osttibet) durch die Brag-g.yab skyabs-mgon." In Herbert Franke and Walther Heissig, eds., *Heilen und Schenken: Festschrift für Günther Klinge zum 70. Geburtstag*. Asiatiasche Forschungen 71 (Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz): 12–21.

Das, Rahul Peter. 1988. *Das Wissen von der Lebensspanne der Bäume: Surapāla's Vṛkṣāyurveda*. Alt- und Neu-Indische Studien 34 (Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag).

Das, Rai Sarat Chandra. 1902. *A Tibetan-English Dictionary* (Calcutta: Bengal Secretariat Book Depot. Reprint: Kyoto: Rinsen, 1979).

De Groot, J[ohannes] J[acobus] M[arius]. 1894. "Militant Spirit of the Buddhist Clergy in China." *Journal of the China Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society, for the Year 1891–92* (n.s.) 26: 108–120.

Demoto Mitsuyo 出本充代. 1991. "'Avadāna-shataka' ni tsuite" 『アヴァダーナ・シャタカ』について [On the *Avadānaśataka*]. Master's thesis, Department of Sanskrit, Faculty of Letters, Kyoto University.

———. 1998. "Avadānaśataka *no bonkan hikaku kenkyū" Avadānaśataka* の梵漢比較研究." Ph.D. diss., Department of Sanskrit, Faculty of Letters, Kyoto University.

Deo, Shantaram Bhalchandra. 1956. *History of Jaina Monachism: From Inscriptions and Literature* (Poona: Deccan College Postgraduate and Research Institute).

Derrett, John Duncan Martin. 1983. *A Textbook for Novices: Jayarakṣita's «Perspicuous Commentary on the Compendium of Conduct by Śrîghana»*. Pubblicazioni di «Indologica Taurinensia» 15 (Torino: Indologica Taurinensia).

Desgodins, Auguste. 1899. *Dictionnaire Thibétain-Latin-Français par Les Missionnaires Catholiques du Thibet* (Hong Kong: Imprimerie de la Société des Missions Étrangères).

De Visser, M[arinus] W[illem]. 1931. *The Bodhisattva Ākāśagarbha (Kokūzō) in China and Japan*. Verhandelingen der Koninklijke Akademie van Wetenschappen te Amsterdam, Afdeeling Letterkunde, Nieuwe Reeks, Deel 30/1 (Amsterdam: Uitgave van de Koninklijke Akademie van Wetenschappen te Amsterdam).

Diskalkar, D. B. 1925. "Some Unpublished Copper-plates of the Rulers of Valabhī." *Journal of the Bombay Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society* (ns.) 1: 13–64.

Downing, Michael. 2001. *Shoes Outside the Door: Desire, Devotion, and Excess at San Francisco Zen Center* (Washington, D.C.: Counterpoint).

Durt, Hubert. 1979. "Chū." *Hōbōgirin: Dictionnaire Encyclopédique du Bouddhisme d'après les Sources Chinoises et Japonaises*, vol. 5 (Tokyo: Maison Franco-Japonaise): 431a–456a.

———. 1983. "Daiji." *Hōbōgirin: Dictionnaire Encyclopédique du Bouddhisme d'après les Sources Chinoises et Japonaises*, vol. 6 (Paris: Libraire d'Amérique et d'Orient Adrien-Maisonneuve/Tokyo: Maison Franco-Japonaise): 679b–681b.

Dutt, Nalinaksha. 1939–1959. *Gilgit Manuscripts*, 4 vols. in 9 parts (Srinagar and Calcutta: J. C. Sarkhel at the Calcutta Oriental Press).

———. 1966. *Bodhisattvabhūmi (Being the XVth Section of Asaṅgapāda's YOGĀCĀRABHŪMIḤ)*. Tibetan Sanskrit Works 7 (Patna: K. P. Jayaswal Research Institute. Reprint: 1978).

Dutt, Sukumar. 1924. *Early Buddhist Monachism* (London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trübner. Reprint: New Delhi: Munshiram Manoharlal, 1984).

———. 1962. *Buddhist Monks and Monasteries of India: Their History and Their Contribution to Indian Culture* (London: George Allen and Unwin).

Edgerton, Franklin. 1953. *Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit Grammar and Dictionary*. 2 vols. (New Haven: Yale University Press).

Eimer, Helmut. 1983. *Rab Tu 'Byuṅ Ba'i Gži*, 2 vols. Asiatische Forschungen 82 (Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz).

Ekelund, Robert B., Robert F. Hébert, Robert D. Tollison, Gary M. Anderson, and Audrey B. Davidson. 1996. *Sacred Trust: The Medieval Church as an Economic Firm* (New York: Oxford University Press).

Enomoto, Fumio. 1994. *A Comprehensive Study of the Chinese* Saṁyuktāgama: *Indic Texts Corresponding to the Chinese* Saṁyuktāgama *as Found in the Sarvāstivāda-Mūlasarvāstivāda Literature. Part 1: *Saṁgītanipāta* (Kyoto: The Author).

Ensink, Jacob. 1952. *The Question of Rāṣṭrapāla* (Zwolle: Tijl).

Fausbøll, V[iggo]. 1877–1896. *The Jātaka Together with Its Commentary, Being Tales of the Anterior Births of Gotama Buddha*, vols. I–VI (London: Trübner/Kegan Paul Trench Trübner).

Feer, [Henri-]Léon. 1884–1898. *The Saṁyutta-Nikāya of the Sutta-Piṭaka* (London: Pali Text Society).

———. 1891. *Avadāna-Çataka: Cents Legendes Bouddhiques*. Annales du Musée Guimet 18 (Paris. Reprint: Amsterdam: APA Oriental Press, 1979).

———. 1893. “Professions Interdites par le Bouddhisme.” In *Actes du huitième Congrès International des Orientalistes, tenu en 1889 à Stockholm et à Christiania*. Troisième Partie, Section II: Aryenne (Leiden: Brill).

———. 1901. “Le Karma-çataka.” *Journal Asiatique,* Neuvième série, tome 17: 53–100, 257–315, 410–486.

Fick, Richard. 1920. *The Social Organisation of North-East India in Buddha’s Time* Trans. Shishirkumar Maitra (Calcutta. Reprint: Delhi: Indological Book House, 1972).

Filliozat, Jean. 1980. “Puṇya and Its Semantic Field.” In Filliozat, *Religion, Philosophy, Yoga: A Selection of Articles by Jean Filliozat*. Trans. Maurice Shukla (Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1991): 233–51. Originally “Sur le domaine sémantique de puṇya.” In *Indianisme et Bouddhisme: Mélanges offerts à Mgr Étienne Lamotte*. Publications de l’Institut Orientaliste de Louvain 23 (Louvain: Université Catholique de Louvain, Institut Orientaliste): 101–116.

Finot, Louis. 1901. *Rāṣṭrapālaparipṛcchā: Sūtra du Mahāyāna*. Bibliotheca Buddhica II (St. Petersburg: Imperial Academy. Reprint: Indo-Iranian Reprints II. The Hague: Mouton, 1957).

Finot, Louis, and Édouard Huber. 1913. “Le Prātimokṣasūtra des Sarvāstivādins.” *Journal Asiatique* (11th ser) 2: 465–558.

Forte, Antonino. 2005. *Political Propoganda and Ideology in China at the End of the Seventh Century: Inquiry into the Nature, Authors and Function of the Dunhuang Document S. 6502 Followed by an Annotated Translation*. Italian School of East Asian Studies Monographs 1 (Kyoto: Scuola Italiana di Studi sull’Asia Orientale).

Frauwallner, Erich. 1956. *The Earliest Vinaya and the Beginnings of Buddhist Literature*. Serie Orientale Roma 8 (Rome: Istituto Italiano per il Medio ed Estremo Oriente).

Frye, Stanley. 1981. *The Sutra of the Wise and the Foolish (mdo bdzans blun); or, The Ocean of Narratives (üliger-ün dalai)* (Dharamsala: Library of Tibetan Works and Archives).

Fujita Kōkan 藤田光寛. 1988. “‘*Bodhisattvaprātimokṣacatuṣkanirhāra*’ ni tsuite” <*Bodhisattvaprātimokṣacatuṣkanirhāra*>について [On the *Bodhisattvaprātimokṣa-catuṣkanirhāra*]. *Mikkyō Bunka* 密教文化 163: 132–117 [*sic*].

Fukita, Takamichi. 2003. *The Mahāvadānasūtra: A New Edition Based on Manuscripts Discovered in Northern Turkestan*. Sanskrit-Wörterbuch der buddhistischen Texte aus den Turfan-Funden, Beiheft 10 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht).

Fukui Rikichirō 福井利吉郎. 1917. “Tōdaijihon Kengukyō no kenkyū” 東大寺本賢愚經の研究 [The Tōdaiji *Xianyu-jing*]. *Geibun* 藝文 3/11: 463–483; 12: 546–573.

Fussman, Gerard. 1985. “Deux dédicaces kharoṣṭhī.” *Bulletin de l’École française d’Extrême-Orient* 74: 29–34.

———. 1987. “Numismatic and Epigraphic Evidence for the Chronology of Early Gandharan Art.” In Marianne Yaldiz and Wibke Lobo, eds., *Investigating Indian Art: Proceedings of a Symposium on the Development of Early Buddhist and Hindu Iconography Held at the Museum of Indian Art, Berlin, in May 1986*. Veröffentlichungen des

Museums für Indische Kunst Berlin 8 (Berlin: Museum für Indische Kunst: Staatliche Museen Preussischen Kulturbesitz): 67–88.
———. 1989. "Gāndhārī écrité, gāndhārī parlée." In Colette Caillat, ed., *Dialectes dans les Littératures Indo-Aryennes*. Publicationes de L'Institut de Civilisation Indienne, Série in-8°, fasc. 55 (Paris: Collège de France, Institut de Civilisation Indienne): 433–501.
Gai, G. S. 1960. "Banavasi Inscription of Vinhukada Satakanni: Year 12." *Epigraphia Indica* 34/5 (Delhi: Manager of Publications): 239–242.
Ganguly, Dilip Kumar. 1975. *Historical Geography and Dynastic History of Orissa: Up to the Rise of the Imperial Gaṅgas* (Calcutta: Punthi Pustak).
Geiger, Wilhelm Ludwig. 1943. *Pāli Literature and Language*. Trans. Batakrishna Ghosh (Calcutta: University of Calcutta. Reprint: Delhi: Munshiram Manoharlal, 1978).
Gernet, Jacques. 1956. *Les Aspects Économiques du Bouddhisme dans la Société Chinoise du Ve au Xe Siécle*. Publications de l'École française d'Extrême Orient 39 (Paris: École française d'Extrême-Orient). English translation: *Buddhism in Chinese Society: An Economic History from the Fifth to the Tenth Centuries*. Trans. Franciscus Verellen (New York: Columbia University Press, 1995).
———. 1967. "Chiji." *Hōbōgirin: Dictionnaire Encyclopédique du Bouddhisme d'après les Sources Chinoises et Japonaises*, vol. 4 (Paris: Libraire d'Amérique et d'Orient Adrien-Maisonneuve/Tokyo: Maison Franco-Japonaise): 306–308.
Gnoli, Raniero. 1978a. *The Gilgit Manuscript of the Śayanāsanavastu and the Adhikaraṇavastu: Being the 15th and 16th Sections of the Vinaya of the Mūlasarvāstivādin*. Serie Orientale Roma 50 (Rome: Istituto Italiano per il Medio ed Estremo Oriente).
———. 1978b. *The Gilgit Manuscript of the Saṅghabhedavastu: Part 2*. Serie Orientale Roma 49/2 (Rome: Istituto Italiano per il Medio ed Estremo Oriente).
Gokhale, Shobana. 1991. *Kanheri Inscriptions* (Pune: Deccan College Post Graduate and Research Institute).
Gómez, Luis O[scar]. 1987. "From the Extraordinary to the Ordinary: Images of the Bodhisattva in East Asia." In Donald S. Lopez, Jr., and Steven C. Rockefeller, eds., *The Christ and the Bodhisattva* (Albany: State University of New York Press): 141–191.
Gunawardana, R[anaweera] A[ppuhamilage] L[eslie] H[erbert]. 1979. *Robe and Plough: Monasticism and Economic Interest in Early Medieval Sri Lanka*. The Association for Asian Studies: Mongraphs and Papers 35 (Tucson: University of Arizona Press).
Gyatso, Janet. 1999. "Healing Burns with Fire: The Facilitations of Experience in Tibetan Buddhism." *Journal of the American Academy of Religion* 67/1: 113–147
Hadano Hakuyū 羽田野伯猷 et al. 1993. *Yugashijiron Bosatsuji* 瑜伽師地論 菩薩地. Chibetto Butten Kenkyū Sōsho チベット仏典研究叢書 II.1 (Kyoto: Hōzōkan 法蔵館).
Hahn, Michael. 1982. *Nāgārjuna's Ratnāvalī: Vol. 1. The Basic Texts (Sanskrit, Tibetan, Chinese)*. Indica et Tibetica 1 (Bonn: Indica et Tibetica Verlag).
———. 1992. "The Avadānaśataka and Its Affiliation." In Albrecht Wezler and Ernst Hammerschmidt, eds., *Proceedings of the XXXII International Congress for Asian*

and North African Studies, Hamburg 25th–30th August 1986. Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft Supplement IX (Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag): 170–171.

———. 1999. *Invitation to Enlightenment: Letter to the Great King Kaniṣka by Mātṛceṭa, Letter to a Disciple by Candragomin* (Berkeley, Calif.: Dharma Publishing).

Hakamaya Noriaki 袴谷憲昭. 1993a. "Akugō fusshoku no gishiki kanren kyōten zakkō" 悪業払拭の儀式関連経典雑考 (III) [Sūtras concerned with Rites for Extinguishing Evil: 3]. *Komazawa Daigaku Bukkyōgakubu Kenkyū Kiyō* 駒澤大学仏教学部研究紀要 51: 337–298 (1–40). Reprinted in Hakamaya 2002; I refer to the original.

———. 1993b. "Akugō fusshoku no gishiki kanren kyōten zakkō" 悪業払拭の儀式関連経典雑考 (IV) [Sūtras concerned with Rites for Extinguishing Evil: 4]. *Komazawa Daigaku Bukkyōgakubu Ronshū* 駒澤大学仏教学部論集 24: 434–413 (37–58). Reprinted in Hakamaya 2002; I refer to the original.

———. 1995. "Senbestugakuha to tenkyogakuha no muhyō ronsō" 選別学派と典拠学派の無表論争 [The Controversy between Vaibhāṣika and Sautrāntika concerning *Avijñapti*]. *Komazawa Tanki Daigaku Kenkyū Kiyō* 駒澤短期大学研究紀要 23: 45–94.

———. 1996a. "Akugō fusshoku no gishiki kanren kyōten zakkō" 悪業払拭の儀式関連経典雑考 (VI) [Sūtras concerned with Rites for Extinguishing Evil: 6]. *Komazawa Tanki Daigaku Kenkyū Kiyō* 駒澤短期大学研究紀要 24: 67–91. Reprinted in Hakamaya 2002; I refer to the original.

———. 1996b. "Shoki daijō bukkyō undō ni okeru Hokekyō: Uddiśya no yōrei o chūshin toshite" 初期大乗仏教運動における『法華経』: Uddiśya の用例を中心として [The Lotus Sūtra in the Early Mahāyāna Movement: On Uddiśya]. In Suguro Shinjō Hakushi Koki Kinen Ronbunshū Kankōkai 勝呂信静博士古稀記念論文集刊行会, ed., *Suguro Shinjō Hakushi Koki Kinen Ronbunshū* 勝呂信静博士古稀記念論文集 (Tokyo: Sankibō Busshorin 山喜房佛書林): 235–250.

———. 1999. "*Yogācārabhūmi* ni okeru rokujūyon-shu no ujōbunrui risuto ni tsuite" *Yogācārabhūmi* における 64種の有情分類リストについて [The List of Sixty-Four Types of Beings in the *Yogācārabhūmi*]. *Komazawa Tanki Daigaku Kenkyū Kiyō* 駒澤短期大学研究紀要 27: 139–172.

———. 2001. "Hinnyo no ittō monogatari: *Shōzen jōbutsu* no haikei (2)" 貧女の一灯物語—「小善成仏」の背景 (2) [The Lamp of the Poor Woman: Background to the Attainment of Buddhahood with Few Roots of Merit]. *Komazawa Tanki Daigaku Bukkyō Ronshū* 駒澤短期大學佛教論集 7: 306–271 (1–36).

———. 2002. *Bukkyō Kyōdan Shiron* 仏教教団史論 (Tokyo: Daizō shuppan 大蔵出版).

Hara, Minoru. 1969. "A Note on the Epic Folk-Etymology of *Rājan*." *Journal of the Ganganatha Jha Research Institute* 25: 489–499.

Hardy, E[dmund]. 1894. *Dhammapāla's Paramattha-dīpanī: Part III, Being the Commentary on the Peta-Vatthu* (London: Pali Text Society).

Harrison, Paul. 1992. Druma-kinnararāja-paripṛcchā-sūtra*: A Critical Edition of the Tibetan Text (Recension A) Based on Eight Editions of the Kanjur and the Dunhuang Manuscript Fragment*. Studia. Philologica Buddhica, Monograph Series VII (Tokyo: International Institute for Buddhist Studies).

Härtel, Herbert. 1956. *Karmavācanā: Formulare für den Gebrauch im buddhistischen Gemeindeleben aus ostturkistanischen Sanskrit-Handschriften*. Sanskrittexte aus den Turfanfunden 3. Deutsche Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin, Institut für Orientforschung, Veröffentlichung 30 (Berlin: Akademie-Verlag).

Hartmann, Jens-Uwe. 1985. "Zur Frage der Schulzugehörigkeit des Avadānaśataka." In Heinz Bechert, ed., *Zu Schulzugehörigkeit von Werken der Hīnayāna-Literatur*, vol. 1. (Symposien zur Buddhismusforschung, III,1). Abhandlungen der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen, philologisch-historische Klasse, Dritte Folge 154 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht): 219–224

Hatani Ryōtai 羽渓了諦. 1934. "Daijikkyō to Kyaradai to no kankei" 大集經と佉羅帝との關係 [The *Mahāsamnipātasūtra* and Kharādīya]. *Shūkyō Kenkyū* 宗教研究 (n.s.) 11/5: 1–14 (731–744).

Hazra, Kanai Lal. 1984. *Royal Patronage of Buddhism in Ancient India* (Delhi: D. K. Publications).

Hikata Ryūshō 干潟竜祥 and Takahara Shin'ichi 高原信一. 1990. *Jātaka Mārā (Honshōdan no Hanagazura)* ジャータカ· マーラー（本生談の花鬘). Indo Koten Sōsho インド古典叢書 (Tokyo: Kodansha 講談社).

Hirakawa Akira 平川彰. 1964. *Genshi Bukkyō no Kenkyū: Kyōdan Soshiki no Genkei* 原始仏教の研究: 教団組織の原型 (Reprint: Tokyo: Shunjūsha 春秋社, 1980).

———. 1968. *Shoki Daijō Bukkyō no Kenkyū* 初期大乗仏教の研究 (Tokyo: Shunjūsha 春秋社).

———. 1970. *Ritsuzō no Kenkyū* 律蔵の研究 (Tokyo: Sankibō 山喜房).

———. 1982. *Monastic Discipline for the Buddhist Nuns: An English Translation of the Chinese Text of the Mahāsāṁghika-Bhikṣuṇi-Vinaya*. Tibetan Sanskrit Works Series 21 (Patna: Kashi Prasad Jayaswal Research Institute).

———. 1990. *Shoki Daijō Bukkyō no Kenkyū* 初期大乗仏教の研究, vol. 2. Hirakawa Akira Chosakushū 平川彰著作集 4 (Tokyo: Shunjūsha 春秋社).

———. 1993a. *Nihyakugojikkai no Kenkyū*二百五十戒の研究, vol. 1. Hirakawa Akira Chosakushū 平川彰著作集 14 (Tokyo: Shunjūsha 春秋社).

———. 1993b. *Nihyakugojikkai no Kenkyū* 二百五十戒の研究, vol. 2. Hirakawa Akira Chosakushū 平川彰著作集 15 (Tokyo: Shunjūsha 春秋社).

———. 1994. *Nihyakugojikkai no Kenkyū* 二百五十戒の研究, vol. 3. Hirakawa Akira Chosakushū 平川彰著作集 16 (Tokyo: Shunjūsha 春秋社).

———. 1995. *Nihyakugojikkai no Kenkyū* 二百五十戒の研究, vol. 4. Hirakawa Akira Chosakushū 平川彰著作集 17 (Tokyo: Shunjūsha 春秋社).

———. 1998. *Bikuniritsu no Kenkyū* 比丘尼律の研究. Hirakawa Akira Chosakushū 平川彰著作集 13 (Tokyo: Shunjūsha 春秋社).

Hiraoka Satoshi 平岡聡. 1996. "Machi no sentakufu ni yoru fuse monogatari: *Divya avadāna* dainana-shō wayaku" 町の洗濯婦による布施物語: 『ディヴィヤ· アヴァダーナ』第 7 章和訳 [A Japanese Translation of the *Nagarāvalambikāvadāna*, *Divyāvadāna* 7]. *Bukkyō Daigaku Sōgō Kenkyūjo Kiyō* 佛教大學総合研究所紀要 3: 68–88.

———. 2002. *Setsuwa no Kōkogaku: Indo Bukkyō Setsuwa ni himerareta Shisō* 説話の考古学: インド仏教説話に秘められた思想 (Tokyo: Daizō shuppan 大蔵出版).

Hōbōgirin. 1929–. *Dictionnaire Encyclopédique du Bouddhisme d'après les Sources Chinoises et Japonaises* (Tokyo: Maison Franco-Japonaise).

Hoernle, A[ugust] F[riedrich] R[udolf]. 1882. "Readings from the Bharhut Stûpa: Part III." *Indian Antiquary* 11: 25–32.

Horner, Isaline Blew. 1938–1966. *The Book of the Discipline (Vinaya Piṭaka)* (London: Pali Text Society).

———. 1954–1959. *The Collection of the Middle Length Sayings (Majjhima-nikāya)* (Reprint: London: Pali Text Society, 1976–1977).

Hucker, Charles O. 1985. *A Dictionary of Official Titles in Imperial China* (Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press).

Hultzsch, E[ugen]. 1886. "Berichtigungen und Nachträge zu den Amarâvatî-Inschriften." *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft* 40: 343–346.

Huntington, C[laire] W., Jr. 1995. "A Lost Text of Early Indian Madhyamaka." *Asiatische Studien/Études Asiatiques* 49/4: 693–767.

———. 2003. "Was Candrakīrti a Prāsaṅgika?" In Sara McClintock and Georges Dreyfus, eds., *The Svatantrika-Prasangika Distinction: What Difference Does a Difference Make?* (Boston: Wisdom Publications): 67–91.

Hurvitz, Leon. 1956. "Wei Shou: Treatise on Buddhism and Taoism: An English Translation of the Original Chinese Text of Wei-shu CXIV and the Japanese Annotation of Tsukamoto Zenryū." In Mizuno Seiichi 水野清一 and Nagahiro Toshio 長広敏雄, eds., *Yün-kang: The Buddhist Cave-temples of the Fifth Century A.D. in North China/Unkō sekkutsu: Seireki Goseiki ni okeru Chūgoku hokubu Bukkyō Kutsuin no Kōkogakuteki chōsa hōkoku* 雲岡石窟・西暦五世紀における中國北部佛教窟院の考古學的調査報告, vol. 16 (Kyoto: Jinbun kagaku kenkyūjo).

Hüsken, Ute. 1999. "Rephrased Rules: The Application of Monks' Prescriptions to the Nuns' Discipline in Early Buddhist Law." *Bukkyō Kenkyū* 佛教研究 28: 19–29.

Huth, Georg. 1891. *Die Tibetische Version der Naiḥsargikaprāyaçcittikadharmās: Buddhistische Sühnreglen aus dem Pratimokshasūtram* (Strassburg: Karl J. Trübner).

Hu-von Hinüber, Haiyan. 1991. "Das Anschlagen der *Gaṇḍī* in buddhistischen Klöstern: Über einige einschlägige Vinaya-Termini." In Li Zheng 李錚 et al., eds., *Ji Xianlin Jiaoshou Bashi Huadan Jinian Lunwenji* 季羨林教授八十華誕記念論文集/*Papers in Honour of Prof. Dr. Ji Xianlin on the Occasion of His 80th Birthday*, 2 vols. (Jiangxi: Jiangxi renmin chubanshe 江西人民出版社): 2: 737–768.

———. 1994. *Das Poṣadhavastu: Vorschriften für die buddhistische Beichtfeier im Vinaya der Mūlasarvāstivādins*. Aufgrund des Sanskrit-Textes der Gilgit-Handschrift und der tibetischen Version sowie unter Berücksichtigung der Sanskrit-Fragmente des Poṣadhavastu aus zentralasiatischen Handschriftenfunden herausgegeben, mit Parallelversionen verglichen, übersetzt und kommentiert. Studien zur Indologie und Iranistik, Monographie 13 (Reinbek: Verlag für Orientalische Fachpublikationen).

———. 1997. "On the Sources of Some Entries in the *Mahāvyutpatti*: Contributions to Indo-Tibetan Lexicography I." In Heinz Bechert, Sven Bretfeld, and Petra

Kieffer-Pülz, eds., *Untersuchungen zur buddhistischen Literatur: Zweite Folge: Gustav Roth zum 80. Geburtstag gewidmet*. Sanskrit-Wörterbuch der buddhistischen texte aus den Turfan-Funden, Beiheft 8 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht): 182–199.

Iibuchi Junko 飯渕純子. 1995. "*Karmaśataka* ni tsuite: Seigan o chūshin ni" *Karmaśataka* について: 誓願を中心に [Vows in the *Karmaśataka*]. *Indogaku Shūkyō Gakkai Ronshū* 印度学宗教学会論集 22: 1–17 (128–112).

———. 1997. "*Karmaśataka* ni okeru juki: Jōbyakushibutsu juki o chūshin ni" *Karmaśataka* における授記: 成辟支仏授記を中心に [Prophecies in the *Karmaśataka*: Prediction to the Attainment of Pratyekabuddhahood]. *Bunka* 文化 60/3–4: 34–54 (407–387).

———. 1998. "*Karmaśataka* ni okeru Nentōbutsu juki monogatari: *Karamaśataka* dai-ni ni okeru *Divyāvadāna* oyobi *Konponsetsu issaiubu binaya hasōji* tono parareru monogatari ni tsuite" *Karmaśataka* における燃燈仏授記物語"": *Karmaśataka* 第 2 における *Divyāvadāna* および『根本説一切有部毘奈耶破僧事』とのパラレル物語について[The Story of the Prophecy of Dīpaṅkara in the *Karmaśataka*: Parallels to *Karmaśataka* 2 in the *Divyāvadāna* and the *Saṅghabhedavastu* of the Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya]. *Nihon Chibetto Gakkai Kaihō* 日本西藏學會々報 43: 23–30.

———. 1999. "*Karumashataka* ni okeru Butsuden no kijutsu ni tsuite" 『カルマシャタカ』における「仏伝」の記述について [Descriptions of the Legend of the Buddha in the *Karmaśataka*]. *Bukkyōgaku* 佛教學 41: 41–62.

Indraji, Pandit Bhagwânlâl. 1881. "An Inscription at Gayâ Dated in the Year 1813 of Buddha's Nirvâna, with Two Others of the Same Period." *Indian Antiquary* 10: 341–347.

Inokuchi Taijun 井ノ口泰淳. 1981. "Chūō Ajia shutsudo no ritten" 中央アジア出土の律典 [Vinaya Texts from Central Asia]. In Sasaki Kyōgo 佐々木教悟, ed., *Kairitsu Shisō no Kenkyū* 戒律思想の研究 (Kyoto: Heirakuji shoten 平楽寺書店): 183–204.

Inoue Akira 井上陽. 1999. "*Navakarmika* to yobareta shukkesha" *Navakarmika* と呼ばれた出家者 [Monks and Nuns Called *Navakarmika*]. *Indogaku Bukkyōgaku Kenkyū* 印度学仏教学研究 47/2: 858–856 (167–169).

Ishihama Yumiko and Yoichi Fukuda. 1989. *A New Critical Edition of the* Mahāvyutpatti. Studia Tibetica 16. Materials for Tibetan-Mongolian Dictionaries 1 (Tokyo: Toyo Bunko).

Iwata Tomoko 岩田朋子. 2004. "Gazagu kendo ni tokareru vihāra hōnō no in'endan: Konpon setsuissaiubu ritsu o chūshin ni" 臥坐具犍度に説かれる vihāra 奉納の因縁譚・根本説一切有部律を中心に. [A Superintendent of the Construction of a Vihāra in the *Śāyanāsanavastu* of the *Mūlasarvāstivādavinaya*]. *Bukkyō Shigaku Kenkyū* 仏教史学研究 47/1: 28–51.

Jacobi, Hermann. 1879. *The Kalpasutra of Bhadrabāhu*. Abhandlungen für die Kunde des Morgenlandes 7.1 (Leipzig. Reprint: Nendeln, Liechtenstein: Kraus Reprint, 1966).

———. 1884. *Gaina Sûtras*. The Sacred Books of the East 22 (Oxford: Clarendon. Reprint: New York: Dover, 1968).

Jaffe, Richard Mark. 2001. *Neither Monk nor Layman: Clerical Marriage in Modern Japanese Buddhism* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press).
Jain, Balachandra. 1971. "Sirpur Inscription of Acharya Buddhaghosa." *Epigraphia Indica* 38/2 (Delhi: Manager of Publications): 59–62.
Jäschke, Heinrich August. 1881. *A Tibetan-English Dictionary* (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul).
Jayawickrama, N. A. 1971. *The Chronicle of the Thūpa and the Thūpavaṁsa, Being a Translation and Edition of Vācissaratthera's Thūpavaṁsa* (London: Luzac).
———. 1990. *The Story of Gotama Buddha (The Nidāna-kathā of the Jātakaṭṭha-kathā)*(Oxford: Pali Text Society).
Jinananda, B. 1969. *Abhisamācārikā (Bhikṣuprakīrṇaka)*. Tibetan Sanskrit Works Series 9 (Patna: Kashi Prasad Jayaswal Research Institute).
Kabata Ryōshun 賀幡亮俊. 1957. "Sōji biku: Dabbamāra ni tsuite" 相似比丘・ダッバマーラに就いて [Sham Monks and the Group of Dabba]. *Indogaku Bukkyōgaku Kenkyū* 印度学仏教学研究 5/1: 158–159.
Kajiyama Yuichi. 1982. "Women in Buddhism." *Eastern Buddhist* (n.s.) 15/2: 53–70. Reprinted in Katsumi Mimaki, ed., *Y. Kajiyama: Studies in Buddhist Philosophy (Selected Papers)* (Kyoto: Rinsen, 1989): 53–70.
Kangle, R. P. 1963. *The Kauṭilīya Arthaśāstra: Part II. An English Translation with Critical and Explanatory Notes*. University of Bombay Studies: Sanskrit, Prakrit and Pali 2 (Bombay: University of Bombay).
———. 1969. *The Kauṭilīya Arthaśāstra*: *Part I. A Critical Edition with a Glossary*, 2nd ed. (Bombay: University of Bombay. Reprint: Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1986).
Karashima Seishi 辛嶋静志. 2000a. "Pārigo, Bukkyō Bongo kenkyū nōto" パーリ語・仏教梵語研究ノート [Notes on Some Pāli and Buddhist Sanskrit Words]. *Sōka Daigaku Kokusai Bukkyōgaku Kōtō Kenkyūjo Nenpō* 創価大学国際仏教学高等研究所年報/*Annual Report of the International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology at Soka University* 3: 37–64.
———. 2000b. "A Fragment of the Prātimokṣa-Vibhaṅga of the Mahāsāṁghika-Lokottaravādins." In Jens Braarvig, Jens-Uwe Hartmann, Kazunobu Matsuda, and Lore Sander, eds., *Buddhist Manuscripts*, vol. 1. Manuscripts in the Schøyen Collection I (Oslo: Hermes): 233–241.
———. 2001. "Who Composed the Lotus Sutra? Antagonism between Wilderness and Village Monks." *Sōka Daigaku Kokusai Bukkyōgaku Kōtō Kenkyūjo Nenpō* 創価大学国際仏教学高等研究所年報/*Annual Report of the International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology at Soka University* 4: 143–179.
Karunatillake, P. V. B. 1980. "The Administrative Organization of the Nālandā Mahāvihāra from Sigillary Evidence." *Sri Lanka Journal of the Humanities* 6/1–2: 57–69.
Katare, Sant Lal. 1957. "Kalanjara Inscription of V.S. 1147." *Epigraphia Indica* 31/4 (Delhi: Manager of Publications): 163–166.
Katsuzaki Yūgen 勝崎祐彦, Komine Michihiko 小峰弥彦, Shimoda Masahiro 下田正弘, and Watanabe Shōgo 渡辺章悟. 1997. *Daijōkyōten Kaisetsujiten* 大乗経典解説事典 (Tokyo: Hokushindō 北辰堂).

Kern, Hendrik. 1891. *The Jataka-Mala: Stories of Buddha's Former Incarnations: Otherwise Entitled Bodhisattva-avadāna-mālā, by Ārya-çūra.* Harvard Oriental Series 1. (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1943).

Khoroche, Peter. 1989. *Once the Buddha Was a Monkey: Ārya Śūra's* Jātakamāla (Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press).

Kieffer-Pülz, Petra. 1992. *Die Sīmā: Vorschriften zur Gegelung der buddistischen Gemeindegrenze in älteren buddhistischen Texten.* Monographien zur indischen Archäologie, Kunst und Philologie 8 (Berlin: Dietrich Reimer Verlag).

Kielhorn, [Lorenz] F[ranz]. 1888. "A Buddhist Stone-Inscription from Ghosrawa." *Indian Antiquary* 17: 307–312.

———. 1896. "Pandukesvar Plate of Lalitasuradeva." *Indian Antiquary* 25: 177–184.

———. 1898. "Pādamūla Pādamūlika." *Indian Antiquary* 27: 252.

Konno, Michitaka 今野道隆. 2002. "Ritsuzō ni okeru bhattuddesaka to jikiji (bhatta)" 律藏における bhattuddesaka と食事 (bhatta) [Bhattuddesaka and Meal (Bhattu) in the Vinaya Piṭaka]. *Tōyō Daigaku Daigakuin Kiyō* 東洋大学大学院紀要 39: 1–19 (118–100).

———. 2004a. "Pāri-ritsu ni okeru gazajo o wariateru futatsu no yakushoku: Senāsanapaññāpaka to senāsanagāhāpaka ni tsuite" パーリ律における臥座処を割り当てる2つの役職・senāsanapaññāpaka と senāsanagāhāpaka について [The Two Officers who Allot Lodgings in the Pāli Vinaya: Senāsanapaññāpaka and Senāsanagāhāpaka]. *Indogaku Bukkyōgaku Kenkyū* 印度学仏教学研究 52/2: 868–866 (87–89).

———. 2004b. "Gazajo no kanrinin to bunpainin: Kan'yaku-ritsu o chūshin toshite" 臥座処の管理人と分配人・漢訳律を中心として [The Supervisor and Distributor of Beds and Seats in Vinaya Texts Preserved in Chinese]. *Indogaku Bukkyōgaku Kenkyū* 印度学仏教学研究 53/1: 401–399 (80–82).

Konow, Sten. 1929a. *Kharoṣṭhī Inscriptions, with the Exception of Those of Aśoka.* Corpus Inscriptionum Indicarum II/1 (Calcutta. Reprint: New Delhi: Director General, Archaeological Survey of India, 1991).

———. 1929b. "Remarks on a Kharoṣṭhī Inscription from the Kurram Valley." In *Indian Studies in Honor of Charles Rockwell Lanman* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press): 53–67.

———. 1940. "The Hidda Inscription of the Year 28." *Epigraphia Indica* 23 (Delhi: Manager of Publications): 35–42.

Kudo, Noriyuki. 2004. *The* Karmavibhaṅga*: Transliterations and Annotations of the Original Sanskrit Manuscripts from Nepal.* Bibliotheca Philologica et Philosophica Buddhica 7 (Tokyo: International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology, Soka University).

Lahiri, Latika. 1986. *Chinese Monks in India: Biography of Eminent Monks Who Went to the Western World in Search of the Law during the Great T'ang Dynasty by I-Ching* (Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass).

Lalou, Marcelle. 1931. "Retrospective: L'oeuvre de Léon Feer." *Bibliographie Bouddhique II: Mai 1929–Mai 1930.* Buddhica, Documents et Travaux pour l'Étude du Bouddhisme. Deuxieme serie, Documents 5 (Paris: Librairie Orientaliste Paul Geuthner): 1–17.

———. 1953. “Les textes bouddhiques au temps du roi Khri-sroṅ-lde-bcan.” *Journal Asiatique* 241: 313-353.

Lamotte, Étienne Paul Marie. 1944–1980. *Le Traité de la grande Vertu de Sagesse,* 5 vols. Publications de l’Institut Orientaliste de Louvain 25, 26 (originally Bibliothèque du Muséon 18), 2, 12, 24 (Louvain: Université de Louvain. Reprint: 1970–1981).

Lariviere, Richard W. 1989. *The Nāradasmṛti: Critically edited with an introduction, annotated translation, and appendices.* University of Pennsylvania Studies on South Asia 4. 2 vols. (Philadelphia: Department of South Asia Regional Studies, University of Pennsylvania).

Laufer, Berthold. 1916. “Loan-words in Tibetan.” *T’oung-pao* (2nd ser.) 17/4: 403–552.

La Vallée Poussin, Louis de. 1923–1931. *L’Abhidharmakośa de Vasubandhu* (Paris: Geuthner. Reprinted as *Mélanges chinois et bouddhiques* 16 [Brussels: Institut Belge des hautes Études Chinoises, 1971]).

———. 1937. “Staupikam.” *Harvard Journal of Asian Studies* 2: 276–289.

Leighton, Taigen Daniel, and Shohaku Okumura. 1996. *Dōgen’s Pure Standards for the Zen Community: A Translation of* Eihei Shingi (Albany: State University of New York Press).

Lévi, Sylvain. 1896. “Les Donations Religieuses des Rois de Valabhī.” Bibliothèque de l’École des Hautes-Études, Sciences religieuses 7. *Études de critique et d’histoire* 2: 75–100. Reprinted in *Mémorial Sylvain Lévi* (Paris: Paul Hartmann, 1937; Reprint: Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1996): 214–234.

———. 1915. “Sur la Récitation Primitive des Textes Bouddhiques.” *Journal Asiatique* (11th ser.) 5/3: 401–447.

———. 1925. “Le Sūtra du Sage et du Fou dans la Littérature de l’Asie Centrale.” *Journal Asiatique* 207/2: 304–332.

———. 1932. *Mahākarmavibhaṅga (La Grande Classification des Actes) et Karmavibhaṅgopadeśa (Discussion sur le Mahā Karmavibhaṅga)* (Paris: Librairie Ernest Leroux).

Lévi, Sylvain, and Édouard Chavannes. 1915. “Quelques Titres Énigmatiques dans la Hiérarchie Ecclésiastique du Bouddhisme Indien.” *Journal Asiatique* (11th ser.) 5: 193–223; 6: 307–310.

Li, Rongxi. 1993. *The Biographical Scripture of King Aśoka.* BDK English Tripiṭaka 76-II (Berkeley, Calif.: Numata Center for Buddhist Translation and Research).

Lokesh Chandra. 1971. *The Collected Works of Bu-ston: Part 24 (ya).* Śata-Piṭaka Series 64 (New Delhi: International Academy of Indian Culture).

Lopez, Donald S., Jr. 1988. “Sanctification on the Bodhisattva Path.” In Richard Kieckhefer and George D. Bond, eds., *Sainthood: Its Manifestations in World Religions* (Berkeley: University of California Press): 172–217.

Lüders, Heinrich. 1909. “The Manikiala Inscription.” *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland* 1909: 645–666.

———. 1912. “A List of Brāhmī Inscriptions from the Earliest Times to about A.D. 400, with the Exception of Those of Aśoka.” *Appendix to Epigraphia Indica* 10 (Calcutta: Superintendent Government Printing, India): 1–96.

———. 1954. *Beobachtungen über die Sprache des Buddhistichen Urkanons.* Ed. Ernst Waldschmidt. Abhandlungen der Deutschen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu

Berlin, Klasse für Sprachen, Literatur und Kunst, Jahrgang 1952 Nr. 10 (Berlin: Akademie-Verlag).

———. 1961. *Mathurā Inscriptions*. Ed. Klaus L. Janert. Abhandlungen der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen, philologisch-historische Klasse, dritten Folge 47(Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht).

———. 1963. *Bharhut Inscriptions* (*Brāhmī-Inscriptions from Bhārhut*). Rev. E[rnst] Waldschmidt and M[adhukar] A[nant] Mehendale. Corpus Inscriptionum Indicarum II/2 (Ootacamund: Government Epigraphist for India).

Majumdar, N. G. 1926. *Nālandā Copper-plate of Devapāladeva*. Monographs of the Varendra Research Society 1 (Rajshahi: Varendra Research Society).

———. 1931. "Nalanda Inscription of Vipulasrimitra." *Epigraphia Indica* 21 (Delhi: Manager of Publications): 97–101.

Makita Tairyō 牧田諦亮. 1967. "Daisōsōshiryaku" 大宋僧史略. In *Kokuyaku Issaikyō Wakan Senjutsubu* 国訳一切経和漢選述部, Shidenbu 史伝部 13 (Reprint: Tokyo: Daitō shuppansha 大東出版社, 1988): 293–375.

Malalasekera, George Peiris [Gunapala Piyasena]. 1938. *Dictionary of Pāli Proper Names* (London: Pali Text Society).

Marasinghe, E. W. 1989. *The Vāstuvidyā Śāstra Ascribed to Mañjuśrī*. Bibliotheca Indo-Buddhica 67 (Delhi: Sri Satguru).

Matsuda Shindō 松田真道. 1981a. "Indo Bukkyō kyōdan ni okeru zaizokusha ārāmika no kōsatsu (jo)" インド佛教教団における在俗者 ārāmika の考察 (序) [On the Lay *Ārāmika* in the Indian Buddhist Community]. *Shūkyō Kenkyū* 宗教研究 54/3: 264–265 (508–509).

———. 1981b. "Shitsujinin veyyāvaccakara to shuennin ārāmika" 執事人 veyyāvaccakara と守園人 ārāmika [*Veyyāvaccakara* and *Ārāmika*]. *Indogaku Bukkyōgaku Kenkyū* 印度学仏教学研究 30/1: 124–125.

———. 1982a. "Indo Bukkyō kyōdan-shi ni okeru jōnin no kōsatsu" インド佛教教団史における淨人の考察 [The *kappiyakāraka* in the History of the Indian Buddhist Community]. *Sōtōshū Kenkyūin Kenkyūsei Kenkyū Kiyō* 曹洞宗研究員研究生研究紀要 14: 137–154.

———. 1982b. "Vihāra-pāla to jishu (vihāra-svāmin)" Vihāra-pāla と寺主 (vihāra-svāmin) [*Vihāra-pāla* and *Vihāra-Svāmin*]. *Indogaku Bukkyōgaku Kenkyū* 印度学仏教学研究 31/1: 313–315.

———. 1982c. "Samantapāsādikā *Zenkenritsu Bibasha* no jōnin" Samantapāsādikā 『善見律毘婆沙』の淨人 [The *Jingren* in the *Samantapāsādikā*]. *Shūkyō Kenkyū* 宗教研究 55/3 (250): 142–144 (366–368).

———. 1983a. "Indo Bukkyō kyōdan no yakushoku no kigen" インド佛教教団の役職の起源 [The Origins of Saṅgha Officers in Indian Buddhist Communities]. *Sōtōshū Kenkyūin Kenkyūsei Kenkyū Kiyō* 曹洞宗研究員研究生研究紀要 15: 114–131.

———. 1983b. "Zenshū kyōdan no jōnin" 禅宗教団の浄人 [The Purifying Man in Chan Buddhism]. *Komazawa Daigaku Sōtōshū Shūgaku Kenkyūjo Shūgaku Kenkyū* 駒沢大学曹洞宗宗学研究所宗学研究 25: 202–205.

Matsumoto Bunzaburō 松本文三郎. 1917. "Tonkōbon Daiunkyō to Kengukyō (shōzen): 2 Kengukyō" 燉煌本大雲經と賢愚經 (承前) 二、賢愚經 [The Dunhuang *Mahāmeghasūtra* and the *Xianyu-jing*: 2. The *Xianyu-jing*]. *Geibun* 藝文 3/5: 542–556.

———. 1927. *Butten Hihyōron* 佛典批評論 (Kyoto: Kobundō 弘文堂).

Matsumura, Hisashi. 1990. "Miscellaneous Notes on the Upālipariprcchā and Related Texts." *Acta Orientalia* (Copenhagen) 51: 61–113.

———. 1996. "The Kaṭhinavastu from the Vinayavastu of the Mūlasarvāstivādins." In *Sanskrit-Texte aus dem buddhistischen Kanon: Neuentdeckungen und Neueditionen*, vol. 3. Sanskrit-Wörterbuch der buddhistischen Texte aus den Turfan-Funden, Beiheft 6 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht): 144–239.

May, Jacques. 1979. "Chōrō." In *Hōbōgirin: Dictionnaire Encyclopédique du Bouddhisme d'après les Sources Chinoises et Japonaises*, vol. 5 (Paris: Librairie d'Amérique et d'Orient Adrien-Maisonneuve/Tokyo: Maison Franco-Japonaise): 380–392.

Mehta, R. N., and S. N. Chowdhary. 1962. "Preliminary Note on the Excavations of the Devnīmorī Stūpa 1962–63." *Journal of the Oriental Institute* (Baroda) 12/2: 173–176.

———. 1966. *Excavation at Devnimori (A Report of the Excavation Conducted from 1960 to 1963)* (Baroda: Department of Archaeology and Ancient History, Faculty of Arts, Maharaja Sayajirao University of Baroda).

Mirashi, V. V. 1965. "Devnī Morī Casket Inscription of the Reign of Rudrasena Year 127." *Vishveshvaranand Indological Journal* 3: 101–104.

Misra, Binayak. 1934. *Orissa under the Bhauma Kings* (Calcutta: The Vishwamitra Press).

Mitsuhara Hōshū 蜜波羅鳳洲. 2004. *Bonzō kanwa taishō Hōjūkyō (Ratnarāśi-sūtra)* 梵蔵漢和対照　宝聚経 (Ratnarāśi-sūtra)/*A Contrastive Study of Sanskrit and the Versions of Tibetan, Chinese, Japanese, of the Ratnarāśi-sūtra* (Tokyo: Sankibō Busshorin 山喜房佛書林).

Mochizuki, Kaie 望月海慧. 1999. "The Sūtras Cited in the *Mahāsūtrasamuccaya* of Dīpaṁkaraśrījñāna." Private printing, distributed at the Twelfth Conference of the International Association of Buddhist Studies in Lausanne, Switzerland, August 1999.

———. 2002a. "Shitsuji o toku kyōten" 執事を説く経典 [Texts on Administration]. In Sasaki Takanori Hakushi Koki Kinen Ronshū Bukkyōgaku Bukkyōshi Ronshū Kankōkai 佐々木孝憲博士古稀記念論文集刊行会, ed., *Sasaki Takanori Hakushi Koki Kinen Ronshū Bukkyōgaku Bukkyōshi Ronshū* 佐々木孝憲古稀記念論集　仏教学仏教史論集 (Tokyo: Sankibō Busshorin 山喜房佛書林): 103–130 (520–493).

———. 2002b. *A Study of the* Mahāsūtrasamuccaya *of Dīpaṁkaraśrījñāna: A Report of Grant-in-Aid for Encouragement of Young Scientists* (Project 127100009). Privately printed.

———. 2004. *A Study of the* Mahāsūtrasamuccaya *of Dīpaṁkaraśrījñāna II*. Tibetan Text. Privately printed

Mochizuki Shinkō 望月信亭. 1932–1936. *Bukkyō Daijiten* 佛教大辭典 (Tokyo: Sekai Seiten Kankō Kyōkai 世界聖典刊行協会).

Mohapatra, Bimal Chandra. 1995. *Buddhism and Socio-Economic Life of Eastern India, with Special Reference to Bengal and Orissa (8th–12th Centuries AD)*. Reconstructing Indian History and Culture 9 (New Delhi: D. K. Printworld).

Monier-Williams, Monier. 1899. *A Sanskrit-English Dictionary: Etymologically and Philologically Arranged with Special Reference to Cognate Indo-European Languages* (Oxford: Clarendon).

Morohashi Tetsuji 諸橋轍次. 1955–1960. *Dai Kanwa Jiten* 大漢和辭典 (Tokyo: Daishūkan shoten 大修館書店).

Morris, Richard, and Edmund Hardy. 1885–1900. *The Aṅguttara-Nikāya*, 2nd ed. Rev. A. K. Warder (London: Pali Text Society. Reprint: 1961).

Mukherjee, B. N. 1964. "Shāh-jī-kī-ḍherī Casket Inscription." *British Museum Quarterly* 28/1–2: 39–46.

Mukhopadhyaya, Sujitkumar. 1963. *The Aśokāvadāna: Sanskrit Text Compared with Chinese Versions* (New Delhi: Sahitya Akademi).

Murakami Shinkan 村上真完. 1968. "Rāṣṭrapālaparipṛcchā no goi" Rāṣṭrapālaparipṛcchā の語彙 [The Vocabulary of the *Rāṣṭrapālaparipṛcchā*]. *Hachinohe Kōgyō Kōtōsenmongakkō Kiyō* 八戸工業高等専門学校紀要 3: 61–83.

Murthy, S. S. Ramchandra. 1971. "Hyderabad Museum Plates of Prithivi-Sri-Mularaja." *Epigraphia Indica* 38/4: 192–195.

Naitō Ryūo 内藤龍雄. 1955. "Daihōben butsuhōon-gyō ni tsuite" 大方便佛報恩經について [On the *Dafangbian fobaoen jing*]. *Indogaku Bukkyōgaku Kenkyū* 印度学仏教学研究 3/2: 695–697 (313–315).

Nakamura Hajime 中村元. 1981. *Bukkyōgo Daijiten* 仏教語大辞典 (Tokyo: Tōkyō Shoseki 東京書籍).

———. 1982–1991. *Jātaka Zenshū* ジャータカ全集, 10 vols. (Tokyo: Shunjūsha 春秋社).

Ñāṅamoli, Bhikkhu. 1995. *The Middle Length Discourses of the Buddha: A New Translation of the Majjhima Nikāya*. Ed. and rev. Bhikkhu Bodhi (Boston: Wisdom Publications).

Näther, Volkbert. 1975. *Das Gilgit-Fragment Or. 11878A im Britischen Museum zu London: Herausgegeben, mit dem Tibetischen verglichen und übersetzt* (Marburg: Erich Mauersberger).

Nattier, Jan. 2003. *A Few Good Men: The Bodhisattva Path according to the Inquiry of Ugra (Ugraparipṛcchā)* (Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press).

Nikam, N. A., and Richard McKeon. 1959. *The Edicts of Asoka* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press).

Njammasch, Marlene. 1970. "Hierarchische Strukturen in den buddhistischen Klöstern Indiens in der ersten Hälfe des ersten Jahrtausends unserer Zeitrechnung." *Ethnographisch-Archäologische Zeitschrift* 11: 515–539.

———. 1974. "Der *navakammika* und seine Stellung in der Hierarchie der buddhistischen Klöster." *Altorientalische Forschungen* 1: 279–293.

Nobel, Julius Adolf Johannes. 1944. *Suvarṇabhāsottamasūtra: Das Goldglanz-sūtra, ein Sanskrittext des Mahāyāna-Buddhismus. Die tibetischen Übersetzung mit einem Wörterbuch*, vol. 1 (Leiden: Brill).

———. 1955. *Udrāyaṇa, König von Roruka: Eine buddhistische Erzählung: Die tibetische Übersetzung des Sanskrittextes: Erster Teil: Tibetischer Text, deutsche Übersetzung und Anmerkungen* (Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz).

Nolot, Édith. 1991. *Règles de Discipline des Nonnes Bouddhistes*. Collège de France, Publications de l'Institut de Civilisation Indienne 60 (Paris: Collège de France).

———. 1996. "Studies in Vinaya Technical Terms I–III." *Journal of the Pali Text Society* 22: 73–150.

Norman, H[arry] C[ampbell]. 1911. *The Commentary on the Dhammapada*, vol. 2 (London: Pali Text Society).

Norman, K[enneth] R[oy]. 1982. "Aśokan *silā-thaṁbha*-s and *dhaṁma-thaṁbha*-s." *Ācārya-vandanā (D. R. Bhandarkar Birth Centenary Volume)* (Calcutta): 311–318. Reprinted in *Collected Papers*, vol. 2 (Oxford: Pali Text Society, 1991): 224–232.

Nornang, Ngawang L. 1990. "Monastic Organization and Economy at Dwags-po bshad-grub-gling." In Lawrence Epstein and Richard F. Sherburne, eds., *Reflections on Tibetan Culture: Essays in Memory of Turrell V. Wylie*. Studies in Asian Thought and Religion 12 (Lewiston, Maine: Edwin Mellen Press): 249–268.

Ñyāṇamoli [*sic*], Bhikkhu. 1956, 1964. *The Path of Purification* (*Visuddhimagga*) (Sri Lanka. Reprint: Berkeley, Calif., and London: Shambhala, 1976).

Obermiller, Eugene [Evgenni Eugen'evich]. 1931–1932. *History of Buddhism (Chos ḥbyung) by Bu-ston: Part I. The Jewelry of Scripture*; *Part II. The History of Buddhism in India and Tibet*. Materialien zur Kunde des Buddhismus 18, 19 (Heidelberg: Harrassowitz. Reprint: Tokyo: Suzuki Research Foundation, 1964).

Oda Tokunō 織田得能. 1917. *Bukkyō Daijiten* 佛教大辭典 (Rev. ed.: Tokyo: Daizō shuppan 大藏出版, 1974).

Oguibenine, Boris. 1983. "From a Vedic Ritual to the Buddhist Practice of Initiation into the Doctrine." In Philip Denwood and Alexander Piatigorsky, eds., *Buddhist Studies: Ancient and Modern*. Centre of South Asian Studies, School of Oriental and African Studies, University of London Collected Papers on South Asia 4 (London: Curzon/Totowa, N.J.: Barnes & Noble): 107–123.

Okada Mamiko 岡田真美子. 1994a. "*Karmaśataka* ni okeru futatsu no *Kyūgi shashin-dan*: *Kame honshō* to *Tokage honshō*" *Karmaśataka* における 2つの『球蟻捨身譚』:『亀本生』と『トカゲ本生』 [Two Ant Stories in the *Karmaśataka*: The Tortoise-Jātaka and the Lizard-Jātaka]. *Kōbe Joshi Daigaku Kyōiku Gakka Kenkyūkai Kyōiku Shogaku Kenkyū Ronbunshū* 神戸女子大学教育学科研究会 教育諸学研究論文集 8: 53–65.

———. 1994b. "Chi no fuse monogatari (1) Jirikiō setsuwa: *Karmaśataka* 48-wa no heikōwa" 血の布施物語 (1) 慈力王説話: *Karmaśataka* 48 話の並行話 [Blood-giving (1) Maitrī (a)bala: Parallels to *Karmaśataka* 48]. *Indogaku Bukkyōgaku Kenkyū* 印度学仏教学研究 43/1: 318–314 (207–211).

Okada, Yukihiro. 1990. *Nāgārjuna's Ratnāvalī: Vol. 2. Die Ratnāvalīṭīkā des Ajitamitra*. Indica et Tibetica 19 (Bonn: Indica et Tibetica Verlag).

Oldenberg, Hermann. 1879–1883. *The Vinaya Piṭakaṁ: One of the Principal Buddhist Holy Scriptures in the Pāli Language*, 5 vols. (Reprint: London: Pali Text Society, 1984).

Ono Genmyō 小野玄妙. 1931. "Ryō Shōgonji Hōshō no Honbongo to Asuka-dera Shingyō no Bongoshū" 梁莊嚴寺寶唱の翻梵語と飛鳥寺信行の梵語集 [The *Fanfan yu* of the Liang Monk Baochang of the Zhuangyan-si and the *Bongoshū* of Shingyō of the Asuka-dera]. *Butten Kenkyū* 佛典研究 3/22: 1–4.

———. 1932–1935. *Bussho Kaisetsu Daijiten* 佛書解説大辭典 (Tokyo: Daitō shuppan-sha 大東出版社).

Ōno Hōdō 大野法道. 1954. *Daijō Kaikyō no Kenkyū* 大乘戒經の研究 (Tokyo: Sankibō Busshorin 山喜房佛書林).

Pachow, W., and Ramakanta Mishra. 1956. *The Prātimokṣa-sūtra of the Mahāsāṅghikās* (Allahabad: Ganganatha Jha Research Institute).

Pāsādika, Bhikkhu. 1989. *Nāgārjuna's Sūtrasamuccaya: A Critical Edition of the Mdo kun las btus pa*. Fontes Tibetici Havnienses 2 (Copenhagen: Akademisk Forlag).

Pelliot, Paul. 1929. "Neuf Notes sur des Questions d'Asie Centrale." *T'oung-pao* (2nd ser.) 26/4–5: 201–265.

Pischel, Richard. 1904. "Neue Bruchstücke des Sanskritkanons der Buddhisten aus Idykutšari, Chinesisch-Turkestān." *Sitzungsberichte der königlich preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften*. Jahrgang 1904, Zweiter Halbband: 1138–1145.

———. 1981. *A Grammar of the Prākrit Languages*. Trans. Subhadra Jhā (Reprint: Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass). German original 1900.

Pradhan, Prahlad. 1975. *Abhidharmakośabhāṣyam of Vasubandhu*. Tibetan Sanskrit Works 8 (Patna: K. P. Jayaswal Research Institute).

Prasad, Maulichand. 1984. *A Comparative Study of Abhisamācārikā*. Tibetan Sanskrit Works Series 26 (Patna: Kashi Prasad Jayaswal Research Institute).

Prasad, Nand Kishore. 1972. *Studies in Buddhist and Jaina Monachism*. Prakrit Jaina Institute Research Publication Series 9 (Vaishali: Research Institute of Prakrit, Jainology & Ahimsa).

Prinsep, James. 1837. "Note on Inscriptions at Udayagiri and Khandgiri in Cuttack, in the Lát Character." *Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal* 6: 1072–1091.

Prip-Møller, Johannes. 1937. *Chinese Buddhist Monasteries: Their Plan and Its Function as a Setting for Buddhist Monastic Life* (Copenhagen: G. E. C. Gads Forlag/ London: Oxford University Press. Reprint: Hong Kong: Hong Kong University Press, 1967).

Pruitt, William. 1998. *The Commentary on the Verses of the Therīs (Therīgāthā-Aṭṭhakathā Paramatthadīpanī VI)* (Oxford: Pali Text Society).

Pruitt, William, and K[enneth] R[oy] Norman. 2001. *The Pātimokkha* (Oxford: Pali Text Society).

Przyluski, Jean. 1923. *La Légende de l'Empereur Açoka (Açoka-avadāna) dans les Textes Indiens et Chinois*. Annales du Musée Guimet, Bibliothèque d'Études, tome 31 (Paris: Geuthner).

Przyluski, Jean, and Marcelle Lalou. 1936. "Récits Populaires et Contes Bouddhiques." *Journal Asiatique* 228: 177–191.

Pulleyblank, Edwin G[eorge]. 1991. *Lexicon of Reconstructed Pronunciation in Early Middle Chinese, Late Middle Chinese, and Early Mandarin* (Vancouver: UBC Press).

Python, Pierre. 1973. *Vinaya-viniścaya-Upāli-paripṛcchā: Enquête d'Upāli pour une exégèse de la discipline*. Collection Jean Przyluski 5 (Paris: Adrien-Masionneuve).

Raghu Vira and Lokesh Chandra. 1959. *Gilgit Buddhist Manuscripts (Facsimile Edition)*, part 1. Śata-piṭaka Series, Indo-Asian Literatures 10 (1) (New Delhi: International Academy of Indian Culture).

———. 1974. *Gilgit Buddhist Manuscripts (Facsimile Edition)*, part 6. Śata-piṭaka Series, Indo-Asian Literatures 10 (6) (New Delhi: International Academy of Indian Culture).

Ralston, W[illiam] R[alston] S[hedden]. 1882. *Tibetan Tales, Derived from Indian Sources. Translated from the Tibetan of the Kah-gyur by F. Anton von Schiefner, Done into English from the German, with an Introduction* (London: Trübner).

Reddy, E. Sivanagi. 2005. "Nava Kammikas: The Early Buddhist Sculptors and Architects of Andhradesa (200 BC–600 AD)." In G. Kamalakar and M. Veerender, eds., *Buddhism: Art, Architecture, Literature & Philosophy*, vol. 2 (Delhi: Sharada Publishing House): 445–450.

Rhys Davids, T[homas] W[illiam]. 1880. *Buddhist Birth Stories; or, Jatāka [sic] Tales: The Oldest Collection of Folk-Lore Extant: Being the Jātakatthavaṇṇanā, for the First Time Edited in the Original Pāli by V. Fausböll*. Translation. Volume I (London: Trübner).

Rhys Davids, T[homas] W[illiam], and Hermann Oldenberg. 1881–1885. *Vinaya Texts*. Sacred Books of the East XIII, XVII, XX (Oxford: Clarendon. Reprint: New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1899–1900).

Rhys Davids, T[homas] W[illiam], and William Stede. 1921-1925. *The Pali Text Society's Pali-English Dictionary* (Reprint: London: Pali Text Society, 1979).

Rockhill, W[illiam] Woodville. 1884. *Prâtimoksha-sutra, ou Le Traité d'Émancipation, selon la Version tibétaine, avec Notes et Extraits du Dulva (Vinaya)* (Paris: Ernest Leroux).

Rosen, Valentina. 1959. *Der Vinayavibhaṅga zum Bhikṣuprātimokṣa der Sarvāstivādins: Sanskritfragmente nebst einer Analyser der chinesischen Übersetzung*. Sanskrittexte aus den Turfanfunden 2. Deutsche Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berling, Institut für Orientforschung, Veröffentlichung 27 (Berlin: Akademie-Verlag).

Roth, Gustav. 1970. *Bhikṣuṇī-Vinaya: Manual of Discipline for Buddhist Nuns*. Tibetan Sanskrit Works Series 12 (Patna: K.P. Jayaswal Research Institute).

Ruegg, David Seyfort. 1981. *The Literature of the Madhyamaka School of Philosophy in India*. A History of Indian Literature, vol. VII/1 (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz).

Sada Kyōmyō 佐田聲苗. 1932. "Zōyaku Kengukyō ni taisuru Narutan-ban mokuroku no kisai" 藏譯賢愚經に對するナルタン版目録の記載 [The Description of the Tibetan Translation of the *Xianyu-jing* in the Catalog to the Narthang Kanjur]. *Sōen* 想苑 4/4: 65–67.

Sadakata, Akira 定方晟. 1996. "Inscriptions Kharoṣṭhī Provenant du Marché aux Antiqués de Peshawar." *Journal Asiatique* 284/2: 301–324.

———. 1998. "Kanishika shari yōki meimon kaidoku no kokoromi" カニシカ舎利容器銘文解読の試み [An Attempt at Interpreting the Kaniṣka Casket Inscription]. *Shunjū* 春秋 401: 26–29.

Sahni, Rai Bahadur Daya Ram. 1938. "A Sarada Inscription from Hund." *Epigraphia Indica* 22 (Delhi: Manager of Publications): 97–98.

Sakaki Ryōsaburō 榊亮三郎. 1916. *Mahāvyutpatti* (Kyoto: Kyōto Teikoku Daigaku Bunka Daigaku Sōsho 京都帝國大學文科大學叢書 3. Numerous reprints.).

Sakurabe, Bunkyō 桜部文鏡. 1930-1932. *A Comparative Analytical Catalogue of the Kanjur Division of the Tibetan Tripitaka / Ōtani Daigaku Toshokan Zō: Chibetto Daizōkyō Kanjūru Kandō Mokuroku*, 大谷大學圖書館藏・西藏大藏經甘珠爾勘同目録. 3 vols. (Kyoto: Ōtani Daigaku Toshokan 大谷大學圖書館).

Sakurabe Hajime 桜部建. 1974a. "Gokoku sonja shomon-kyō" 護國尊者所問經. In *Daijō Butten* 大乗仏典, vol. 9, Hōshakubu-kyōten 宝積部経典 (Tokyo: Chūō Kōronsha 中央公論社): 125–230.

———. 1974b. "Ikuka chōja shomon-kyō" 郁伽長者所問經. In *Daijō Butten* 大乗仏典, vol. 9, Hōshakubu-kyōten 宝積部経典 (Tokyo: Chūō Kōronsha 中央公論社): 231–313.

Salomon, Richard. 1997. "Another Reliquary Inscription of the Apraca Princess Uttarā." *Bulletin of the Asia Institute* 11: 183–191.

———. 1998. *Indian Epigraphy: A Guide to the Study of Inscriptions in Sanskrit, Prakrit, and Other Indo-Aryan Languages* (New York: Oxford University Press).

———. 2000. *A Gāndhārī Version of the Rhinoceros Sūtra: British Library Kharoṣṭhī Fragment 5B*. Gandhāran Buddhist Texts 1 (Seattle: University of Washington Press).

———. 2005. "The Indo-Greek Era of 186/5 B.C. in a Buddhist Reliquary Inscription." In Osmund Bopearachchi and Marie-Françoise Boussac, eds., *Afghanistan: Ancien Carrefour entre l'Est et l'Ouest*. Indicopleustoi: Archaeologies of the Indian Ocean 3 (Turnhout: Brepols): 359–401.

Salomon, Richard, and Gregory Schopen. 1984. "The Indravarman (Avaca) Casket Inscription Reconsidered: Further Evidence for Canonical Passages in Buddhist Inscriptions." *Journal of the International Association of Buddhist Studies* 7/1: 107–123.

Sander, Lore, and Ernst Waldschmidt. 1985. *Sanskrithandschriften aus den Turfanfunden*, vol. 5 Verzeichnis der orientalischen Handschriften in Deutschland, X, 5 (Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag Wiesbaden).

Sankalia, H. D. 1941–1942. "Cultural Significance of the Personal Names in the Early Inscriptions of the Deccan." *Bulletin of the Deccan College Research Institute* 3: 349–391.

Sankaranarayanan, S. 1965. "Devnimori Buddhist Relic Casket Inscription of the Time of Rudrasena, Kathika Year 127." *Journal of the Oriental Institute* (Baroda) 15/1: 66–73.

———. 1977. *The Vishṇukuṇḍis and Their Times (An Epigraphical Study)* (Delhi: Agam Prakashan).

Sankrityayana, Rahula. 1981. *Vinayasūtra of Bhadanta Gunaprabha*. Singhi Jain Śāstra Śiksāpītha [*sic*] Singhi Jain Series 74 (Bombay: Bharatiya Vidya Bhavan).

Sasaki Kyōgo 佐々木教悟. 1971. "Konponsetsuissiubu to Sankeimujōkyō ni tsuite" 根本説一切有部と三啓無常経について [The Mūlasarvāstivāda and the *Tridaṇḍaka-Anityatāsūtra*]. *Indogaku Bukkyōgaku Kenkyū* 印度学仏教学研究 19/2: 570–577 (81–88). Reprinted in *Kairitsu to Sōgya* 戒律と僧伽 (Kyoto: Heirakuji shoten 平楽寺書店, 1985): 136–149.

———. 1976. "Risshō no kyōjo ni tsuite" 律摂の経序について [On the Prefatory Verse of the Mūlasarvāstivāda *Vinayasaṁgraha*]. In Okuda Jiō sensei kiju kinen Bukkyō shisō ronshū kankōkai 奥田慈應先生喜寿記念論文集刊行会, ed., *Okuda Jiō Sensei Kiju Kinen Bukkyō Shisō Ronshū:* 奥田慈應先生喜寿記念仏教思想論集 (Kyoto: Heirakuji shoten 平楽寺書店). Reprinted in *Kairitsu to Sōgya* 戒律と僧伽 (Kyoto: Heirakuji shoten 平楽寺書店, 1985): 150–167.

———. 1977. "*Konponsappatabu Risshō* ni tsuite" 根本薩婆多部律摂について [On the Mūlasarvāstivāda *Vinayasaṁgraha*]. *Bukkyōgaku Kenkyū* 印度学仏教学研究 25/2. Reprinted in *Kairitsu to Sōgya* 戒律と僧伽 (Kyoto: Heirakuji shoten 平楽寺書店, 1985): 168–184, as "*Risshō* no seikaku" 律摂の性格 [The Character of the *Vinayasaṁgraha*].

———. 1985. "*Nankai kikiden* ni shirusaretaru rissei" 南海寄帰伝にしるされたる律制 [Vinaya Rules in the *Nanhai jigui naifa zhuan*]. In *Kairitsu to Sōgya* 戒律と僧伽 (Kyoto: Heirakuji shoten 平楽寺書店): 207–299.

Sasaki Mitsunobu 佐々木理信. 1978. "Dabba-Mallaputta (Dabamaraji) to Bukkyō kyōdan seikatsu eii" Dabba-Mallaputta (陀驃摩羅子) と仏教教団生活営為 [Dabba-Mallaputta and the Management of Buddhist Communal Life]. *Indogaku Bukkyōgaku Kenkyū* 印度学仏教学研究 26/2: 869–871 (358–360).

Sasaki Shizuka 佐々木閑. 1993. "Tenzo ni kansuru ichikōsatsu" 典座に関する一考察 [A Note on the Term *Tenzo*]. *Zenbunka Kenkyūjo Kiyō* 禅文化研究所紀要 19: 59–76.

———. 1994. "Buddhist Sects in the Aśoka Period (4): The Structure of the Mahāsāṁghika Vinaya." *Bukkyō Kenkyū* 佛教研究 23: 55–100.

———. 1996. "Biku ni narenai hitobito" 比丘になれない人々 [Those Who Cannot Become Monks]. *Hanazono Daigaku Bungakubu Kenkyū Kiyō* 花園大学文学部研究紀要 28: 111–148.

———. 1997. "Oshō to Ajari" 和尚と阿闍梨 [Upadhyāya and Ācārya]. *Hanazono Daigaku Bungakubu Kenkyū Kiyō* 花園大学文学部研究紀要 29: 1–43.

———. 1999 *Shukke to wa nanika* 出家とはなにか (Tokyo: Daizō shuppan 大藏出版).

Sastri, Hirananda. 1925–1926. "Brahmi Inscription on a Wooden Pillar from Kirari." *Epigraphia Indica* 18 (Calcutta: Manager, Government of India Central Publication Branch): 152–157.

———. 1942. *Nalanda and Its Epigraphic Material*. Memoirs of the Archaeological Survey of India 66 (Delhi: Manager of Publications).

Sastry, P. V. Parabrahma. 1984. "Hyderabad Prakrit Inscription of Govindaraja Vihara." *Journal of the Epigraphical Society of India* 11: 95–100.

Satō Mitsuo 佐藤密雄. 1963. *Genshi Bukkyō Kyōdan no Kenkyū* 原始仏教教團の研究 (Tokyo: Sankibō 山喜房).

Schiefner, Antonius. 1852. *Ergänzungen und Berichtigungen zu Schmidt's Ausgabe des Dsanglun* (St. Petersburg: Kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften).

———. 1868. *Târanâthae de doctrinae Buddhicae in India Propagatione narratio: Contextum Tibeticum* (Petrograd: Imp. Academiae Scientiarum Petropolitanae).

Schmidt, Isaak Jakob. 1845. 'Dzangs Blun *oder der Weise und der Thor*. 2 vols. (St. Petersburg: W. Gräff's Erben/Leipzig: Leopold Voss).

Schmidt, Michael. 1993. "Bhikṣuṇī-Karmavācanā: Die Handschrift Sansk. c.25(R) der Bodleian Library Oxford." In Reinhold Grünendahl, Jens-Uwe Hartmann, and Petra Kieffer-Pülz, eds., *Studien zur Indologie und Buddhismuskunde: Festgabe des Seminars für Indologie und Buddhismuskunde für Professor Dr. Heinz Bechert zum 60. Geburtstag am 26: Juni 1992*. Indica et Tibetica 22 (Bonn: Indica et Tibetica Verlag): 239–288.

Schmidt, Richard. 1928. *Nachträge zum Sanskrit-Wörterbuch in Kürzer Fassung von Otto Böhtlingk* (Leipzig: Harrassowitz. Reprint: Tokyo: Meicho-Fukyukai, 1983).

Schmiedchen, Annette. 1993. "Formulas Determining the Purposes of Donations to Buddhist Monasteries in West and East India from the 5th to the 9th Century A.D." In Adalbert J. Gail and Gerd J. R. Mevissen, eds., *South Asian Archaeology 1991: Proceedings of the Eleventh International Conference of the Association of South Asian Archaeologists in Western Europe Held in Berlin 1–5 July 1991* (Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag): 585–593.

Schmithausen, Lambert. 1991. *The Problem of the Sentience of Plants in Earliest Buddhism*. Studia Philologica Buddhica Monograph Series 6 (Tokyo: International Institute for Buddhist Studies).

———. 1997. "The Early Buddhist Tradition and Ecological Ethics." *Journal of Buddhist Ethics* 4: 1–74.

Schopen, Gregory. 1979. "Mahāyāna in Indian Inscriptions." *Indo-Iranian Journal* 21: 1–19.

———. 1984. "Filial Piety and the Monk in the Practice of Indian Buddhism: A Question of 'Sinicization' Viewed from the Other Side." *T'oung Pao* 70: 110–126. Reprinted in Schopen 1997: 56–71.

———. 1988–1989. "On Monks, Nuns, and 'Vulgar' Practices: The Introduction of the Image Cult into Indian Buddhism." *Artibus Asiae* 49/1–2: 153–168. Reprinted in Schopen 1997: 238–257.

———. 1990. "The Buddha as an Owner of Property and Permanent Resident in Medieval Indian Monasteries." *Journal of Indian Philosophy* 18: 181–217. Reprinted in Schopen 1997: 258–289.

———. 1992a. "On Avoiding Ghosts and Social Censure: Monastic Funerals in the Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya," *Journal of Indian Philosophy* 20: 1–39. Reprinted in Schopen 1997: 204–237.

———. 1992b. "Ritual Obligations and Donor Roles of Monks in the Pāli *Vinaya*." *Journal of the Pāli Text Society* 16: 87–107. Reprinted in Schopen 1997: 72–85.

———. 1994a. "Doing Business for the Lord: Lending on Interest and Written Loan Contracts in the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-Vinaya*." *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 114/4: 527–554.

———. 1994b. "The Monastic Ownership of Servants and Slaves: Local and Legal Factors in the Redactional History of Two *Vinayas*" *Journal of the International Association of Buddhist Studies* 17/2: 145–173.

———. 1995. "Monastic Law Meets the Real World: A Monk's Continuing Right to Inherit Family Property in Classical India." *History of Religions* 35/2: 101–123.

———. 1996. "The Lay Ownership of Monasteries and the Role of the Monk in Mūlasarvāstivādin Monasticism." *Journal of the International Association of Buddhist Studies* 19/1: 81–126.

———. 1997. *Bones, Stones, and Buddhist Monks: Collected Papers on the Archaeology, Epigraphy, and Texts of Monastic Buddhism in India* (Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 1997).

———. 1998. "Marking Time in Buddhist Monasteries: On Calendars, Clocks, and Some Liturgical Practices." In Paul Harrison and Gregory Schopen, eds., *Sūryacandrāya: Essays in Honour of Akira Yuyama on the Occasion of His 65th Birthday.* Indica et Tibetica 35 (Swisttal-Odendorf: Indica et Tibetica Verlag): 157–179.

———. 1999. "The Bones of a Buddha and the Business of a Monk: Conservative Monastic Values in an Early Mahāyāna Polemical Tract." *Journal of Indian Philosophy* 27: 279–324.

———. 2000a. *Daijō Bukkyō Kōki Jidai Indo no Sōin Seikatsu* 大乗仏教興起時代インドの僧院生活. Trans. Odani Nobuchiyo 小谷信千代 (Tokyo: Shunjūsha 春秋社).

———. 2000b. "Hierarchy and Housing in a Buddhist Monastic Code: A Translation of the Sanskrit Text of the *Śāyanāsanavastu* of the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya*—Part One." *Buddhist Literature* 2: 92–196.

———. 2001. "Dead Monks and Bad Debts: Some Provisions of a Buddhist Monastic Inheritance Law." *Indo-Iranian Journal* 44/2: 99–148.

———. 2002. "Counting the Buddha and the Local Spirits In: A Monastic Ritual of Inclusion for the Rain Retreat." *Journal of Indian Philosophy* 30: 359–388.

———. 2006. "On Monks and Menial Laborers: Some Monastic Accounts of Building Buddhist Monasteries." In Pierfrancesco Callieri, ed., *Architetti, Capomastri, Artigiani: L'organizzazione dei cantieri e della praduzione artistica nell'asia ellenistica: Studi offerti a Domenico Facenna nel suo ottantesimo compleanno.* Serie Orientale Roma C (Rome: Instituto Italiano per l'Africa e l'Oriente): 225–245.

Schubring, Walther. 1905. *Das Kalpa-sūtra: Die alte Sammlung jinistischer Mönchsvorschriften.* Indica 2 (Leipzig. Reprinted in Klaus Bruhn, ed., *Walther Schubring Kleine Schriften.* Glasenapp-Stiftung 13 [Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner Verlag, 1977]: 1–69).

———. 1910. "The Kalpasūtra: An Old Collection of Disciplinary Rules for Jaina Monks." Trans. May S. Burgess. *Indian Antiquary* 39: 257–267.

———. 1966. *Drei Chedasūtras des Jaina-Kanons: Āyāradasāo, Vavahāra, Nisīha.* Alt- und Neu-Indische Studien 11 (Hamburg: Cram, de Gruyter).

Schuster, Nancy J. 1976. "The *Ugraparipṛcchā*, the *Mahāratnakūta* and Early Mahāyāna Buddhism." Ph.D. diss., University of Toronto, 2 vols.

Sen, Benoychandra. 1942. *Some Historical Aspects of the Inscriptions of Bengal* [*Pre-Muhammadan Epochs*] (Calcutta: University of Calcutta).

Senart, Émile Charles Marie. 1871. "Kaccāyanappakaraṇaṁ: Grammaire Pâlie de Kaccāyana." *Journal Asiatique* (6th ser.) 17: 193–351, 361–540.

———. 1882–1897. *Le Mahāvastu.* Sociéte Asiatique, Collection d'Ouvrages Orientaux, Seconde Série. 3 vols. (Paris: Imprimerie National. Reprint: Tokyo: Meicho Fukyūkai, 1977).

Seneviratne, H. L. 1999. *The Work of Kings: The New Buddhism in Sri Lanka* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press).

Shackleton Bailey, D[avid] R[oy]. 1950. "Notes on the Divyāvadāna: Part I." *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society* 1950/3–4: 166–184.

———. 1954. Review of Ensink 1952. *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society* 1954/1–2: 79–82.

Shaku Keihō 釋啓峰. 1939. "*Konponsetsuissaiubu risshō* josetsu" 『根本説一切有部律攝』序説 [Introduction to the Mūlasarvāstivāda *Vinayasaṁgraha*]. *Mikkyō Kenkyū* 密教研究 69: 18–36.

———. 1940. "Ubu Risshō gaisetsu" 有部律攝概説 [Outline of the Mūlasarvāstivāda *Vinayasaṁgraha*]. *Mikkyō Kenkyū* 密教研究 72: 48–69.

Sharf, Robert. 1995. "Buddhist Modernism and the Rhetoric of Meditative Experience." *Numen* 42: 228–283.

Shih, Juo-hsüeh. 2000. *Controversies over Buddhist Nuns* (Oxford: Pali Text Society).

Shimoda Masahiro 下田正弘. 1987. "*Daishūbukei Shamikai* no tekisuto ni tsuite" 大衆部系沙弥戒のテキストについて [A Note on the *Sphuṭārthā Śrīghanācārasaṁgrahaṭīkā*]. *Indogaku Bukkyōgaku Kenkyū* 印度学仏教学研究 35/2: 941–939.

Shio Benkyō 椎尾辨匡. 1931. *Bukkyō Kyōten Gaisetsu* 佛教經典概説 (Reprint: Tokyo: Sankō Bunka Kenkyūjo 三康文化研究所, 1971).

Shizutani Masao 静谷正雄. 1957. "Shoki no daijōkyōdan ni tsuite" 初期の大乗教團について [The Early Mahāyāna Community]. *Indogaku Bukkyōgaku Kenkyū* 印度学仏教学研究 5/2: 429–437.

———. 1974. *Shoki Daijō Bukkyō no Seiritsu Katei* 初期大乗仏教の成立過程 (Kyoto: Hyakkaen 百華苑).

———. 1978. *Shōjō Bukkyōshi no Kenkyū* 小乗仏教史の研究 (Kyoto: Hyakkaen 百華苑).

———. 1979. *Indo Bukkyō Himei Mokuroku* インド仏教碑銘目録 (Kyoto: Heirakuji shoten 平楽寺書店).

Silk, Jonathan A. 1992. "A Bibliography on Ancient Indian Slavery." *Studien zur Indologie und Iranistik* 16–17: 277–285.

———. 1994. "The Origins and Early History of the *Mahāratnakūṭa* Tradition of Mahāyāna Buddhism, with a Study of the *Ratnarāśisūtra* and Related Materials." Ph.D. diss., University of Michigan.

———. 1997. "Further remarks on the *yogācāra bhikṣu*." In Bhikkhu Pāsādika and Bhikkhu Tampalawela Dhammaratana, eds., *Dharmadūta: Mélanges offerts au Vénérable Thích Huyên-Vi à l'occasion de son soixante-dixième anniversaire* (Paris: Éditions You Feng): 233–250.

———. 1999. "Marginal Notes on a Study of Buddhism, Economy and Society in China." *Journal of the International Association of Buddhist Studies* 22/2: 359–396.

———. 2000. "The *Yogācāra Bhikṣu*." In J. A. Silk, ed. *Wisdom, Compassion, and the Search for Understanding: The Buddhist Studies Legacy of Gadjin M. Nagao*. Studies in the Buddhist Traditions 3 (Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press): 265–314.

———. 2002. "*Cui bono*? or Follow the Money: Identifying the Sophist in a Pāli Commentary." In Publication Committee for Buddhist and Indian Studies in Honour of Professor Sodō Mori, ed., *Buddhist and Indian Studies in Honour of Professor Sodō Mori* (Hamamatsu: Kokusai Bukkyoto Kyokai): 129–183.

Singh, Sanghasen. 1983. *A Study of the Sphuṭārthā Śrīghanācārasaṅgraha-ṭīkā*, 2nd ed. Tibetan Sanskrit Works Series 24 (Patna: Kashi Prasad Jayaswal Research Institute).

Sircar, D[ines] C[handra]. 1953. “The Era of the Bhauma-Karas of Orissa.” *Indian Historical Quarterly* 29: 148–155.

———. 1957a. “Rashtrakuta Charters from Chinchani.” *Epigraphia Indica* 32/2 (Delhi: Manager of Publications): 45–60.

———. 1957b. “Charter of Vishnusena, Samvat 649.” *Epigraphia Indica* 30/5 (Delhi: Manager of Publications): 163–181

———. 1966. *Indian Epigraphical Glossary* (Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass).

———. 1967. “Fragmentary Copper-plate Grant from Arakan.” *Epigraphia Indica* 37/2 (Delhi: Manager of Publications): 61–66.

———. 1987. “The Designation ‘Varika’ ” In A. M. Shastri, R. K. Sharma, and Agam Prasad, eds., *Vajapeya: Essays on Evolution of Indian Art & Culture: Prof. K. D. Bajpai Felicitation Volume*, vol. 1 (Delhi: Agam Kala Prakashan): 111–112.

Sivaramamurti, C[alambur]. 1942. *Amaravati Sculptures in the Madras Government Museum*. Bulletin of the Madras Government Museum. New Series–General Section, vol. 4 (Madras: Superintendent, Government Press).

Speyer, Jacob Samuel. 1893–1894. “Jātakamālā (Garland of Birth Stories).” *Bijdragen tot de Taal-, Land- en Volkenkunde van Nederlandsch-Indië* 42 [VIII] (1893): 129–182, 254–310, 441–500; 43 [X] (1894): 201–256, 321–385, 616–658.

———. 1895. *The Gātakamālā or Garland of Birth-Stories by Āryasûra*. Sacred Books of the Buddhists 1 (London: Oxford University Press).

———. 1906–1909. *Avadānaçataka: A Century of Edifying Tales Belonging to the Hīnayāna*. Bibliotheca Buddhica 3. Indo-Iranian Reprints 3 (St. Petersburg. Reprint: The Hague: Mouton, 1958).

Srinavasan, P. R. 1967. “Devni-Mori Relic Casket Inscription of Rudrasena, Kathika Year 127.” *Epigraphia Indica* 37/2 (Delhi: Manager of Publications): 67–69.

———. 1976. “Two Fragmentary Charters of Maitraka Dharasena IV.” *Epigraphia Indica* 38 (Delhi: Manager of Publications): 219–224.

Staël-Holstein, Alexander Wilhelm, Baron von. 1926. *The Kāçyapaparivarta: A Mahāyānasūtra of the Ratnakūṭa Class: Edited in the Original Sanskrit in Tibetan and in Chinese* (Shanghai: Commercial Press).

Stein, Otto. 1948. *The Jinist Studies*. Ed. Jina Vijaya Muni (Ahmedabad: Jaina Sahitya Samsodhaka Pratiṣṭhan).

Strong, John. 1983. *The Legend of King Aśoka: A Study and Translation of the* Aśokāvadāna (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press).

Takahashi Moritaka 高橋盛孝. 1962. “Kenkgukyō Chōsaki” 賢愚経探査記 [Researching the *Xianyu-jing*]. *Nihon Chibetto Gakkai Kaihō* 日本西藏學會々報 9: 1–2.

———. 1963. “Kengukyō to Zan run” 賢愚経とザン・ルン [The *Xianyu jing* and *Mdzangs blun*]. *Tōhōgaku* 東方學 26: 47–55.

Takakusu, Junjirō. 1896. *A Record of the Buddhist Religion as Practised in Indian and the Malay Archipelago (A.D. 671–695) by I-Tsing* (Oxford: Clarendon).

———. 1901. “Tales of the Wise Man and the Fool, in Tibetan and Chinese.” *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society* July 1901: 447–460.

Takakusu, Junjirō, and Makoto Nagai (with Kogen Mizuno). 1924–1947. *Samantapāsādikā: Buddhaghosa’s Commentary on the Vinaya Piṭaka* (London: Pali Text Society).

Tamaki Benryū 玉木弁立. 1980. "Kanyaku *Kengukyō* to *Mdsangs-blun* no seiritsu ni tsuite" 漢訳『賢愚経』と『Mdsaṅs-blun』の成立について [The Chinese *Xianyu jing* and the *Mdzangs-blun*]. *Taishō Daigaku Daigakuin Kenkyū Ronshū* 大正大学大学院研究論集 4: 236–224 [*sic*] (1–13).

Tatelman, Joel. 2000. *The Glorious Deeds of Pūrṇa: A Translation and Study of the Pūrṇāvadāna* (Richmond, Surrey, England: Curzon).

Tatia, Nathmal. 1975. *Prātimokṣasūtram*. Tibetan Sanskrit Works Series 16 (Patna: Kashi Prasad Jayaswal Research Institute).

Tatia, Nathmal, and Muni Mahendra Kumar. 1981. *Aspects of Jaina Monasticism* (Ladnun, Rajasthan: Jain Vishva Bharati/New Delhi: Today & Tomorrow's Printers and Publishers).

Tatz, Mark. 1986. *Asanga's Chapter on Ethics with the Commentary of Tsong-Kha-Pa: The Basic Path to Awakening: The Complete Bodhisattva* (Lewiston, Maine: Mellen).

Teiser, Stephen. 1988. *The Ghost Festival in Medieval China* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press).

Terjék, J. 1969, 1970. "Fragments of the Tibetan Sutra of «The Wise and the Fool» from Tun-huang." *Acta Orientalia* (Hungary): 22/3: 289–334; 23/1: 55–83.

Tewari, Shitala Prasad. 1982. "A Note on Varika of the Inscriptions." *Journal of the Epigraphical Society of India* 9: 34–36.

———. 1987. *Contributions of Sanskrit Inscriptions to Lexicography* (Delhi: Agam Kala Prakashan).

Thaplyal, Kiran Kumar. 1972. *Studies in Ancient Indian Seals: A Study of North Indian Seals and Sealings from circa Third Century B.C. to Mid-Seventh Century A.D.* (Lucknow: Akhila Bharatiya Sanskrit Parishad).

Thomas, F[rederick] W[illiam]. 1915. "A Kharosthi Inscription." *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society* 1915: 91–96.

Tokiya Kōki 釋舍幸紀. 1985. "Konponsetsuissaiubu ni in'yō sareru Mujōkyō" 根本説一切有部に引用される無常経 [The *Anityatāsūtra* Quoted in Mūlasarvāstivāda Sources]. *Indogaku Bukkyōgaku Kenkyū* 印度学仏教学研究 34/1: 168–173.

———. 1986. "Mujōkyō no shisōshiteki Igi: Toku ni *Muryōkōbutsu Raisanmon* e no tenkai wo motomete" 無常経の思想史的意義: 特に「無量光仏礼讃文」への展開を求めて [The Meaning of the Sūtra on Impermanence from the Point of View of the History of Thought: Seeking after the Development of the "Praise of Amitābha Buddha"]. *Takata Tanki Daigaku Kiyō* 高田短期大学紀要 4: 14–49.

Tomomatsu Entai 友松圓諦. 1920. "Indo sōdan no shokushō ni tsuite" 印度僧團の職掌について [The Offices of Indian Buddhist Monasteries] *Mugekō* 無礙光 June 3: 7–14 and July 4: 16–20.

———. 1931. "Sūtrālamkāra et Kalpanāmaṇḍitikā" *Journal Asiatique* 219: 135–174, 245–337. Photo-reproduced in Tomomatsu 1970.

———. 1932. *Bukkyō Keizai Shisō Kenkyū: Indo Kodai Bukkyō Jiin Shoyū ni kansuru Gakusetsu* 佛教經濟思想研究・印度古代佛教寺院所有に關する學説 (Tokyo: Tōhō shoin 東方書院).

———. 1933. *Shukke in kinzerareta Eiri Kōi* 出家に禁ぜられた營利行爲. Bukkyō Hōsei Keizai Kenkyūjo monogurafī 佛教法政經濟研究所モノグラフィー 2 (Tokyo: Bukkyō Hōsei Keizai Kenkyūjo 佛教法政經濟研究所).

———. 1965. *Bukkyō ni okeru Bunpai no Riron to Jissai (jō): Bukkyō Keizai Shisō Kenkyū (2)* 佛教に於ける分配の理論と實際 (上) • 佛教經濟思想研究 (2) (Tokyo: Shunjūsha 春秋社).

———. 1970. *Bukkyō ni okeru Bunpai no Riron to Jissai (chū): Bukkyō Keizai Shisō kenkyū (3)* 佛教に於ける分配の理論と實際 (中) • 佛教經濟思想研究 (3) (Tokyo: Shunjūsha 春秋社).

Trenckner, Vilhelm, et al. 1924–. *A Critical Pāli Dictionary* (Copenhagen: Royal Danish Academy).

Trenckner, Vilhelm, and Robert Chalmers. 1888–1896. *The Majjhima-Nikāya* (Reprint: London: Pali Text Society, 1977–1979).

Tsukamoto Keishō 塚本啓祥. 1980. *Shoki Bukkyō Kyōdanshi no Kenkyū* 初期仏教教団史の研究, rev. ed. (Tokyo: Sankibō Busshorin 山喜房仏書林).

———. 1996. *Indo Bukkyō Himei no Kenkyū* インド仏教碑銘の研究 (Kyoto: Heirakuji shoten 平楽寺書店).

Turner, R[alph] L[illy]. 1966. *A Comparative Dictionary of the Indo-Aryan Languages* (London: Oxford University Press).

Ueyama Daishun 上山大峻. 1967–1968. "Daiban-koku Daitoku Sanzō Hōshi Shamon Hōjō no Kenkyū" 大蕃國大德三藏法師沙門法成の研究 [A Study of the Life and Works of Facheng, a Translator of Buddhist Texts at Duhuang under Tibetan Rule]. *Tōhō Gakuhō* 東方學報 38: 133–198; 39: 119–222. Reprinted in *Ajia Bunkashi Ronsō* アジア文化史論叢, vol. 1 [Contributions to West, Central and North Asian Studies: Collected Papers of *Liu-sha Hai-hsi* (流沙海西) Scholarship Prize Winners] (Tokyo: Yamakawa shuppan 山川出版, 1978): 1–179. I cite the latter.

———. 1990. *Tonkō Bukkyō no Kenkyū* 敦煌佛教の研究 (Kyoto: Hōzōkan 法藏館).

Upasak, C. S. 1975. *Dictionary of Early Buddhist Monastic Terms (Based on Pali Literature)* (Varanasi: Bharati Prakashan).

Vadekar, R. D. 1939. *Pātimokkha*. Bhandarkar Oriental Series 1 (Poona: Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute).

Vajirañāṇavarorasa, Somdet Phra Mahā Samaṅa Chao Krom Phrayā. 1983. *The Entrance to the Vinaya: Vinayamukha*, vol. 3 (Bangkok: Mahāmakut Rājavidyālaya).

Venkararamayya, M., and C. B. Trivedi. 1968. "Four Buddhist Inscriptions from Phophnar Kalan." *Epigraphia Indica* 37/3 (Delhi: Manager of Publications): 147–150.

Victoria, Brian. 1997. *Zen at War* (Tokyo: Weatherhill).

Vidyabhusana, Satis Chandra. 1915. "So-sor-thar-pa; or, Code of Buddhist Monastic Laws: Being the Tibetan Version of Prātimokṣa of the Mūla-sarvāstivāda School." *Journal and Proceedings of the Asiatic Society of Bengal* 11/3–4: 29–139.

Vijayarājendrasūrīśvara. 1934. *Abhidhānarājendra*, vol. 6 (Ratlam: Śrījainaprabhākara-yantrālaya).

Vogel, Claus. 1985. "Bu-ston on the Schism of the Buddhist Church and on the Doctrinal Tendencies of Buddhist Scriptures." In Heinz Bechert, ed., *Zu Schulzugehörigkeit von Werken der Hīnayāna-Literatur*, vol. 1 (Symposien zur Buddhismusforschung, III,1). Abhandlungen der Akademie der Wissenschaften

in Göttingen, philologisch-historische Klasse, dritte Folge 149 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht): 104–110.

Vogel, Claus, and Klaus Wille. 1996. "The Final Leaves of the Pravrajyāvastu Portion of the Vinayavastu Manuscript Found Near Gilgit: Part 1: Saṁgharakṣitāvadāna." Edited by Volkbert Näther, revised and translated by C.V. and K.W. *Sanskrit-Texte aus dem buddhistischen Kanon: Neuentdeckungen und Neueditionen*, vol. 3. Sanskrit-Wörterbuch der buddhistischen Texte aus den Turfan-Funden, Beiheft 6 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht): 241–296.

Vogel, Jean Phillipe. 1921–1922. "Shorkot Inscription of the Year 83." *Epigraphia Indica* 16: (Delhi: Manager of Publications) 15–17.

———. 1933. "Prakrit Inscriptions for a Buddhist Site at Nagarjunikonda." *Epigraphia Indica* 20 (Delhi: Manager of Publications): 1–36.

von Hinüber, Oskar. 1986. *Das Ältere Mittelindisch im Überblick*. Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, philosophisch-historische Klasse, Sitzungsberichte 467 (Vienna: Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften).

———. 1992. *Sprachentwicklung und Kulturgeschichte: Ein Beitrag zur materiellen Kultur des buddhistischen Klosterlebens*. Akademie der Wissenschaften und der Literatur. Abhandlungen der geistes- und sozialwissenschaftlichen Klasse, Jahrgang 1992, Nr. 6 (Mainz: Akademie der Wissenschaften und der Literatur/ Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag).

———. 1996. *A Handbook of Pāli Literature* (Berlin: de Gruyter. Reprint: New Delhi: Munshiram Manoharlal, 1997).

von Simson, Georg. 1986. *Prātimokṣasūtra der Sarvāstivādins*. Sanskrittexte aus der Turfanfunden XI. Teil I. Abhandlungen der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen, philologisch-historische Klasse, dritte Folge 155 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht).

———. 2000. *Prātimokṣasūtra der Sarvāstivādins*. Sanskrittexte aus der Turfanfunden XI. Teil II. Abhandlungen der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen, philologisch-historische Klasse, dritte Folge 238 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht).

Waldschmidt, Ernst. 1956. *Das Mahāvadānasūtra, ein kanonischer Text über die sieben letzten Buddhas*. Teil II: Die Textbearbeitung. Abhandlungen der deutschen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin, Klasse für Sprachen, Literatur und Kunst, Jahrgang 1954 Nr. 3 (Berlin: Akademie Verlag).

Waldschmidt, Ernst, et al. 1973–. *Sanskrit-Wörterbuch der buddhistischen Texte aus den Turfan-Funden* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht).

Waldschmidt, Ernst, with Walter Clawiter and Lore Sander-Holzmann. 1968. *Sanskrithandschriften aus den Turfanfunden II*. Verzeichnis der orientalischen Handschriften in Deutschland X, 2 (Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner Verlag).

Walleser, Max. 1924. *Manorathapūraṇī: Buddhaghosa's Commentary on the Aṅguttaranikāya* (London: Pali Text Society).

Wang Bangwei 王邦維. 1988. *Datang Xiyu Qiufa Gaoseng Zhuan Xiaozhu* 大唐西域求法高僧傳校注 (Beijing: Zhonghua shuju 中華書房).

———. 1995. *Nanhai Jigui Neifa Zhuan Xiaozhu* 南海寄歸内法傳校注 (Beijing: Zhonghua shuju 中華書房).

Wang Li 王力. 2002. *Wangli Guhanyu Zidian* 王力古漢語字典 (Peking: Zhonghua shuju 中華書局).

Ware, James R. 1938. "The Preamble to the *Saṁgharakṣitāvadāna*." *Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies* 3: 47–67.

Warren, Henry Clark, and Dharmananda Kosambi. 1950. *Visuddhimagga of Buddhaghosācariya*. Harvard Oriental Series 41 (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press).

Weiger, Léon. 1910. *Bouddhisme Chinois: Vinaya: Monachisme et Discipline, Hinayana, Véhicule Inférieur* (Reprint: Paris: Cathasia, 1951).

Welch, Holmes. 1967. *The Practice of Chinese Buddhism: 1900–1950* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press).

West, E. W. 1861. "Copies of Inscriptions from the Buddhist Cave-Temples of Kánheri, &c. in the Island of Salsette, with a Plan of the Kánheri Caves." *Journal of the Bombay Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society* 6: 1–14.

Wille, Klaus. 1990. *Die handschriftliche Überlieferung des Vinayavastu der Mūlasarvāstivādin*. Verzeichnis der orientalischen Handschriften in Deutschland, Supplementband 30 (Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner Verlag).

Willemen, Charles. 1994. *The Storehouse of Sundry Valuables*. BDK English Tripiṭaka 10-I (Berkeley, Calif.: Numata Center for Buddhist Translation and Research).

Wogihara, Unrai. 1936a. *Bodhisattvabhūmi: A Statement of [the] Whole Course of the Bodhisattva (Being [the] Fifteenth Section of [the] Yogācārabhūmi)* (Reprint: Tokyo: Sankibo Buddhist Bookstore, 1971).

———. 1936b. *Sphuṭārthā Abhidharmakośavyākhyā: The Work of Yaśomitra* (Reprint: Tokyo: Sankibo Buddhist Book Store, 1989).

Woods, James Haughton, and Dharmanand Kosambi. 1928. *Papañcasūdanī. Majjhimanikāyaṭṭhakathā of Buddhaghosâcariya*, vol. 2 (London: Pali Text Society).

Woodward, Frank Lee. 1929–1937. *Sārattha-ppakāsinī: Buddhaghosa's Commentary on the Sanyutta-nikāya* (London: Pali Text Society).

Xibei Minzuxueyuan Minzu Yanjiusuo 西北民族学院民族研究所. 1986. *Bod rgya sangs rgyas chos gzhung gi tshig mdzod/Zanghan Foxue Cidian* 藏漢佛學詞典 (Qinghai: Qinghai Minzu chubanshe 青海民族出版社).

Xibei Minzuxueyuan Zangwenjiaoyan 西北民族学院藏文教研. 1979. *Rgya bod ming mdzod/Zanghan Cidian* 藏漢詞典 (Gansu: Gansu Minzu chubanshe 甘肅民族出版社).

Yamada, Isshi. 1968. *Karuṇāpuṇḍarīka*. 2 vols. (London: School of Oriental and African Studies).

Yamagiwa Nobuyuki 山極伸之. 1999. "Ritsuzō ni awarareru ārāmika" 律蔵にあわられる ārāmika [Ārāmika in the Vinayapiṭaka]. *Indogaku Bukkyōgaku Kenkyū* 印度学仏教学研究 47/2: 852–847 [*sic*] (173–178).

———. 2001. "Genshi bukkyō kyōdan ni okeru jiki no juyō: Jōchi o meguru shomondai" 原始仏教教団における食の受容: 浄地をめぐる諸問題 [Receiving Food in the Early Buddhist Community: The Problem of the Pure Ground]. In Ishigami Zennō Kyōju Koki Kinen Ronbunshū Kankōkai 石上善応教授古稀記念論文集刊行会, ed., *Ishigami Zennō Kyōju Koki Kinen Ronbunshū Bukkyō Bunka no Kichō to*

Tenkai 石上善応教授古稀記念論文集 仏教文化の基調と展開 (Tokyo: Sankibō Busshorin 山喜房佛書林): 307–322.

———. 2002a. "*Ārāmika*—Gardener or Park Keeper? One of the Marginals around the Buddhist *Saṁgha*." In Publication Committee for Buddhist and Indian Studies in Honour of Professor Sodō Mori, ed., *Buddhist and Indian Studies in Honour of Professor Sodō Mori* (Hamamatsu: Kokusai Bukkyoto Kyokai): 363–385.

———. 2002b. "Gakusho-jōbun to innen-monogatari no fuseigō ni mirareru Ritsuzō seiritsushijō no shomondai: Toku ni nisatsugi haitsudai (shada) dai-10 jō o megutte" 学処条文と因縁物語の不整合にみられる律蔵成立史上の諸問題: 得に尼薩耆波逸提（捨堕）第 10 条をめぐって [Some Problems of the Historical Formation of the Vinaya Piṭaka Surrounding the Disagreement between the Sikkhāpada and Its Background Story, with Special Reference to Nissaggiya-Pācittiya 10]. In Sakurabe Hajime Hakushi Kiju Kinen Ronshū Kankōkai 櫻部建博士喜寿記念論集刊行会, ed., *Sakurabe Hajime Hakushi Kiju Kinen Ronshū Shoki Bukkyō kara Abidaruma e* 櫻部建博士喜寿記念論集 初期仏教からアビダルマへ/*Early Buddhism and Abhidharma Thought: In Honor of Doctor Hajime Sakurabe on His Seventy-seventh Birthday* (Kyoto: Heirakuji shoten 平楽寺書店): 199–216.

Yifa. 2002. *The Origins of Buddhist Monastic Codes in China: An Annotated Translation and Study of the* Chanyuan qinggui (Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press).

Yuyama, Akira. 1979. *Systematische Übersicht über die buddhistische Sanskrit-Literatur/A Systematic Survey of Buddhist Sanskrit Literature: Erster Teil: Vinaya-Texte* (Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner Verlag).

Zachariae, Theodor. 1897. *The Maṅkhakośa: Edited together with Extracts from the Commentary, and Three Indices*. Kashi Sanskrit Series 216 (Reprint: Varanasi: Chowkhamba Sanskrit Series Office, 1972). Reprint of the second edition of the original, *Der Maṅkhakośa. Hrsg. mit Auszügen aus dem Commentare und drei Indices*(Vienna/Bombay, 1897), part of the series Quellenwerke der Altindischen Lexikographie 3).

Zhang Yisun 張怡蓀. 1985. *Bod rgya tshig mdzod chen mo/Zanghan Dacidian* 藏漢大辭典 (Peking: Minzu chubanshe 民族出版社).

Zimmer, Heinrich. 1925. *Karman: Ein buddhistischer Legendkranz* (Munich: F. Bruckmann).

Zysk, Kenneth G. 1991. *Asceticism and Healing in Ancient India: Medicine in the Buddhist Monastery* (New York: Oxford University Press).

This page intentionally left blank

Index

Subjects

Indic Technical Terms

Tibetan Technical Terms

Chinese Technical Terms

Texts Cited

Chinese Texts by Taishō Number

T. 1: Dīrghāgama
T. 2: Mahāvadānasūtra
T. 4: Mahāvadānasūtra
T. 7: Mahāparinirvāṇasūtra
T. 26: Madhyamāgama
T. 99, T. 100: Samyuktāgama
T. 125: Ekottarikāgama
T. 156: Dafangbian fobaoen jing 大方便佛報恩經
T. 157, T. 158: Karuṇāpuṇḍarīka
T. 190: *Abhiniṣkramaṇasūtra
T. 200: Avadānaśataka
T. 202: Xianyu jing 賢愚經
T. 203: Zabaozang jing 雜寶藏經
T. 310 (12), 316 : Bodhisattvapiṭaka
T. 310 (14): Nandagarbhāvakrānti
T. 310 (18), T. 321: Raṣṭrapālaparipṛcchā
T. 310 (19), T. 322, T. 323: Ugradattaparipṛcchā
T. 310 (23): Maitreyasiṁhanāda
T. 397 (13) (14): Sūryagarbhasūtra
T. 405, T. 406, T. 408: Ākāśagarbhasūtra
T. 589: Mañjuśrīvikurvaṇa
T. 624, 625: Drummakinnaraparipṛcchā
T. 749: Saṁgharakṣitāvadāna
T. 1421: Mahīśāsaka Vinaya
T. 1422: Mahīśāsaka Prātimokṣasūtra
T. 1425 : Mahāsāṁghika Vinaya
T. 1426: Mahāsāṁghika Prātimokṣa sūtra
T. 1428: Dharmaguptaka Vinaya
T. 1429, 1430: *Dharmagupataka Prātimokṣasūtra
T. 1432: Tanwudelübu zajiemo 曇無悳律部雜羯磨
T. 1433: Jiemo 羯磨
T. 1435: Sarvāstivāda Vinaya
T. 1436: Sarvāstivāda Prātimokṣa sūtra
T. 1441: *Sarvāstivāda Vinayamātṛkā
T. 1442: Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya-vibhaṅga
T. 1443: Mūlasarvāstivāda Bhikṣuṇī Vinaya
T. 1444: Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya Pravrajyāvastu
T. 1445: Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya Varṣāvastu
T. 1448: Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya Bhaiṣajyavastu
T. 1450: Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya Saṁghabhedavastu
T. 1451: Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya Kṣudrakavastu
T. 1453: Ekotarakarmaśataka
T. 1454: Mūlasarvāstivāda Prātimokṣa sūtra
T. 1455: Mūlasarvāstivāda Bhikṣuṇī Prātimokṣa sūtra
T. 1458: Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya-saṁgraha
T. 1459: Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinayakārikā
T. 1460: Kāśyapīya Prātimokṣa sūtra
T. 1462: Samantapāsādikā
T. 1463: *Vinayamātṛkā-sūtra
T. 1464: Sarvāstivāda *Vinaya
T. 1470: Dabiqiu sanqian weiyi 大比丘三千威儀
T. 1509: Mahāprajñāpāramitopadeśa
T. 1521: Daśabhūmivibhāṣā
T. 1558: Abhidharmakośa
T. 1579: Yogācārabhūmi
T. 1656: Ratnāvalī
T. 1733: Huayanjing tanxuan ji 華嚴經探玄記
T. 1804: Sifenlü shanfan buque xingshi chao 四分律刪繁補闕行事鈔
T. 1813: Fanwangjing pusa jieben shu 梵網經菩薩戒本疏
T. 2042, 2034: Aśokarājāvadāna/-sūtra
T. 2066: Datang xiyu qiufa gaoseng zhuan 大唐西域求法高僧傳

Inscriptions Cited

Proper Names